



# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE  
UNITED STATES

---

MARCH 8, 1956

---

**PART 8**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

Boston Public Library  
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 18 1956

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

PRICE DANIEL, Texas

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

HERMAN WELKER, Idaho

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

---

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri

PRICE DANIEL, Texas

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

HERMAN WELKER, Idaho

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*

RICHARD ARENS and ALVA C. CARPENTER, *Associate Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

---

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT  
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10.45 a. m., in room 313, Senate Office Building, Senator Herman Welker presiding.

Present: Senator Welker.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; Alva Carpenter, associate counsel, and Robert C. McManus, investigations analyst.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, will you come forward, please.

Senator WELKER. The committee will come to order.

The subject of the hearing today will be the efforts that Communists have made to influence our Far Eastern policy. The subcommittee has received evidence that certain organizations and publications have been engaged in an extensive lobbying campaign in an effort to attune our foreign policy to the purposes of the Soviet Foreign Office. The witness this morning will be Maud Russell.

Miss Russell, will you please stand? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss RUSSELL. I so swear.

## TESTIMONY OF MAUD RUSSELL

Senator WELKER. Will you state your name, please.

Miss RUSSELL. Maud Russell.

Senator WELKER. Where do you reside?

Miss RUSSELL. New York.

Senator WELKER. And your address there, please?

Miss RUSSELL. 103 West 93d Street.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Thank you.

Counsel, please proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that Miss or Mrs. Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. Miss Russell.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, where were you born?

Miss RUSSELL. California.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year?

Miss RUSSELL. 1893.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us rather sketchily about your educational accomplishments?



Miss RUSSELL. I don't know what accomplishments, but I graduated from the University of California.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year?

Miss RUSSELL. 1915. I studied in England in——

Mr. MORRIS. At what university?

Miss RUSSELL. Woodbrook College.

Mr. MORRIS. Woodbrook.

Miss RUSSELL. And got my M. A. at Columbia in 1945, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. 1945?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. You have lived a considerable portion of your life in China, have you not?

Miss RUSSELL. Twenty-six years.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Will you tell us the span?

Miss RUSSELL. 1917 to 1943.

Mr. MORRIS. 1943. In 1943 you returned to the United States?

Miss RUSSELL. I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what were you doing in China during that period of time?

Miss RUSSELL. I was working with the Chinese WYCA—YWCA.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, in 1943 you returned to New York City, you say?

Miss RUSSELL. I returned to California.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, what did you do in California in 1943?

Miss RUSSELL. Celebrated Thanksgiving with my family, and Christmas.

Mr. MORRIS. And thereafter?

Miss RUSSELL. Studied at Columbia.

Mr. MORRIS. That is in New York City?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you active in the formation of an organization called the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment not to testify against myself.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have received evidence——

Senator WELKER. I think maybe, for the purposes of the record, counsel for the witness might improve a little bit upon that objection, so that there will not be any question about it.

Dave, will you state it for her? And then we will stipulate that that objection will go to all the questions she desires to use it on?

Mr. REIN. Surely. The witness is claiming her fifth-amendment privilege, the constitutional privilege, not to testify against yourself. It is commonly referred to as the privilege against self-incrimination.

Senator WELKER. Very well. I think that is very fine.

Mr. REIN. And it will be understood that in the future her claim of the fifth-amendment privilege will mean that.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Thank you, Mr. Rein.

And I think, for the purposes of the record, you had better show that David Rein, Esq., of the firm of Forer & Rein, is representing the witness.

Will you give the street address, please?

Mr. REIN. 711 14th Street, in Washington, D. C.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, we have received evidence in the course of the Institute of Pacific Relations inquiry, which is reported on pages 4602-4603, and following, to the effect that there was a meeting held

at 23 West 26th Street, which meeting had been called at the direction of Eugene Dennis, then director of the Communist Party, for the purpose of forming the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Testimony at that time indicates that you were present at that founding meeting. Can you recall such an occasion?

(The witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I was not present.

Mr. MORRIS. You were not present at that meeting?

Miss RUSSELL. I know nothing about it. I never heard about it until today.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, do you recall a meeting held at 23 West 26th Street at any time? Did you ever attend a meeting there?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a gentleman named Dr. Max Yergan?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Yergan's testimony at that time, Mr. Chairman, reads—and he is now talking about a meeting held at that address in 1945—there was no date given at the time—he could not recall the specific date—Dr. Yergan testifying:

Well, the purpose was discussed both formally and informally at these two meetings, that being to discredit Chiang Kai-shek, to use all of the influence possible to turn material to the forces in China that were opposing Chiang Kai-shek. That was the general point of emphasis with regard to the purposes of the meeting.

Dr. Yergan was asked who was present at the meeting, and Dr. Yergan replies:

Yes, I recall a lady who was identified in an executive capacity, Miss Russell. Is that Miss Maud Russell?

Dr. YERGAN. Miss Maud Russell. \* \* \*

Now, was that accurate testimony, Miss Russell?

(The witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I was not present at any meeting ever with Eugene Dennis.

Mr. MORRIS. No. I did not say, Miss Russell, that Eugene Dennis was present. I said the meeting was called at his direction and Frederick Field presided at the meeting.

(The witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you recall a meeting, now, at 23 West 26th Street at which Frederick Field presided?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I am offering you a photostat of a letterhead of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, dated August 26, 1945, and I ask you if you will read that photostat.

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment not to read it.

Mr. REIN. Do you want the witness to look at it?

Mr. MORRIS. I just want her to read it.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, Counselor. The question was very apparent and very clear. She was asked whether or not she

would read the exhibit offered to her. She took the fifth amendment on that, and I would like to inquire whether reading any sort of document might tend to incriminate this witness. I want to be fair with her. But it seems that you are taking the fifth amendment a long way. We are not asking her to testify about any contents thereof. She is merely asked to read the exhibit, Mr. Rein.

Miss RUSSELL (reading):

AUGUST 26, 1945.

DEAR FRIEND—

Senator WELKER. No one asked you, madam, to read it aloud.

Mr. MORRIS. I did.

Senator WELKER. Did you?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Senator WELKER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that aloud, Miss Russell?

(The witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I object to reading it.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you so advised your client, Mr. Rein?

Mr. REIN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. You are objecting to reading the exhibit—

Miss RUSSELL. The exhibit aloud.

Senator WELKER. The exhibit aloud?

Mr. MORRIS. What is the basis of the objection, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. And you contend that if you read that aloud you will possibly be testifying against yourself?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Miss Russell, at this time the acting chairman is going to order and direct you to read the exhibit aloud.

(The witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. Under the direction, I will read it:

DEAR FRIEND: The war in the Pacific has not ended. If American policy in China continues along present lines, we shall be helping to lay the basis for a bloody civil war that will undermine much of what we have sacrificed for and won in the past 3½ years.

It is kind of hard on the eyes.

Americans have learned—

Mr. REIN. Mr. Chairman, may I request on behalf of the witness that if any pictures are taken, they be taken now and not interrupt her testimony?

Senator WELKER. Very well. I think that is a reasonable request, Mr. Rein.

Will you gentlemen—

Miss RUSSELL. It hurts my eyes, and I can't see.

Americans—

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, now. I think the photographers want to comply with the request of your counsel.

A VOICE. Would you look right here and say something?

Miss RUSSELL. Shoot.

A VOICE. One more.

A VOICE. Would you say something again, now, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. Shoot.



A VOICE. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Are you gentlemen finished?

Thank you.

Miss RUSSELL. The second paragraph:

Americans have learned in the most painful way possible—

Senator WELKER. Madam, I am sorry. I missed the last sentence you read. Would you mind repeating that?

Miss RUSSELL (reading):

If American policy in China continues along present lines, we shall be helping to lay the basis for a bloody civil war that will undermine much of what we have sacrificed for and won in the past 3½ years.

Americans have learned in the most painful way possible that a small "incident" in China 8 years ago affected every man, woman, and child throughout the world. This time we must use our energies to prevent the recurrence of other "incidents" that can lead only to the destruction of the peace we must have in China and everywhere.

Today our Government spokesmen and military leaders in China are adopting a policy that would not be approved by millions of Americans. They are lending political and military assistance to the Kuomintang dictatorship which has resisted democratic reform in China and has given an order to Japanese and quisl-ling troops to hold their weapons, and if necessary use them rather than surrender to the patriotic Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies that have assumed the greatest burden of Allied fighting in north and central China. This policy on the part of our American representatives in China serves to wipe out the efforts of the Chinese people for a democratic and unified country. When General Stilwell was in China our help was also one-sided, but we were at least trying to get sympathetic contact with all forces fighting the Japanese in China. Now we are meddling, not to accelerate but to hold back the democratic working out of the Chinese situation. We may well find ourselves committed to a new Franco in an Asiatic Spain.

In order to bring the urgent message for action before the American people, the Committee for a Democratic Policy Toward China is now being formed. As its first step, this committee proposes to send an appeal to President Truman urging that policy in China be rectified. You are asked to add your name to the appeal and to get clubs, organizations, and individuals to write immediately to President Truman or take any other appropriate action.

To keep you acquainted with developments in China, the Committee for a Democratic Policy Toward China will issue regular news bulletins, the first of which is enclosed.

We know that you will agree that this new committee must spread its work throughout the country to acquaint the public with the dangers that lie ahead and arouse people to act quickly. In order to do the job well, we need your help—first, add your name to the appeal on the flap of the enclosed envelope, and second, send us your contribution. Without funds we cannot carry out the necessary work, so send whatever you can immediately.

And this is signed by Leland Stowe and Richard Watts, Jr.

The sponsors of the committee:

Dr. Phyllis Ackerman, T. A. Bisson, Israel Epstein, Frederick V. Field, Talitha Gerlach, Rev. Jack McMichael, Arthur Upham Pope, Iona Ralf Sues, Lawrence E. Salisbury, Michael Sayers, Vincent Sheehan, Mrs. Edgar Snow, Maxwell S. Stewart, Leland Stowe, Rose Terlin, Richard Watts, Jr., Dr. Max Yergan.

My name does not appear.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you become the executive director of that organization, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I did not.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you ever executive director of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the question before my last question, Mr. Reporter?

(Question read.)

Mr. REIN. If I may assist, Mr. Morris, this letterhead of this is Committee for a Democratic Policy Toward China, which is a different organization from the one you referred to.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

In other words, it is your testimony that you were not executive director of the organization which the letterhead just describes?

Miss RUSSELL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what was the connection between those two organizations?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, the Daily Worker of May 8, 1949, section 2, pages 3 and 4, contains an article which is headed "Truth Also Fights for Free China."

Maud Russell is quoted as follows in this article:

Yet the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy is not solely a supplier of information. We are a political action group to exert pressure for a change in official United States policy.

Did you make that statement, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have printed in the record at this point in the testimony a document which has already appeared in the hearings of this committee during the investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. Mandel, will you read it?

Senator WELKER. What is the document?

Mr. MORRIS. This is a letter on the letterhead of the Communist Party of New York State, 35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y., dated March 1, 1949.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, it has been identified in our records previously. I wonder if Mr. Mandel will read that letter into the record.

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document which was read by Mr. Mandel, was marked "Exhibit No. 139" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 139

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,  
ROBERT THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN,  
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

*To All Sections and Counties.*

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find Program for Action on China Policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative, but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our District Education Department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West 42 Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,  
Asst. Org. Secretary.



Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy have an office at 111 West 42d Street on March 1, 1949?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know May Miller, who describes herself in this letter as the assistant organizational secretary of the Communist Party of New York?

(Witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I never heard of her.

Mr. MORRIS. During the period 1947 to 1948, did you make frequent visits to Communist Party headquarters at 35 East 12th Street?

(Witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I have never been there.

Mr. MORRIS. You have never been at 35 East 12th Street?

Miss RUSSELL. I have never been there.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever been at 50 East 13th Street?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. What is located at 50 East 13th Street?

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, do you know that 35 East 12th Street and 50 East 13th Street are buildings that are back to back in Manhattan?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know it.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, is it your testimony that you were never in 35 East 12th Street, but when I asked you, were you ever in 50 East 13th Street, you invoke your privilege under the fifth amendment? Do I understand your answer to be that?

Miss RUSSELL. Correct, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And you have no knowledge that those two buildings are connected?

Miss RUSSELL. I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, is there anything in our record that would indicate at this time what 50 East 13th Street and 35 East 12th Street is?

Mr. MANDEL. 50 East 13th Street has been for some years the headquarters of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I ask you if you will look at this article that appeared in the Daily Worker of January 16, 1950, page 2.

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recognize that letter, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I do not, offhand.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you bring that letter back, Mr. Arens, please?

Mr. Mandel, will you identify this article in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MANDEL. It is an article from the Daily Worker of January 16, 1950, page 2, entitled "Facts Behind the Korea Crisis;" subtitle, "Who Started the Shooting?" And underneath it says:

Following is the first of a series of articles entitled "Facts on the Korean Situation," which was prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, to your knowledge, was that article prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. It will be entered into the record at this point.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 140" and is as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 140

[Daily Worker, January 16, 1950]

## FACTS BEHIND THE KOREA CRISIS: WHO STARTED THE SHOOTING?

(Following is the first of a series of articles entitled "Facts on the Korean Situation," which was prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.)

Within hours after the start of the Korean war the United States bluntly accused North Korea of armed aggression against South Korea, an action which it described as a wholly illegal and unprovoked attack. In the absence of the Soviet Union, and with Yugoslavia abstaining, nine members of the United Nations Security Council upon the insistence of the United States hurriedly passed a resolution "noting with grave concern the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea." All subsequent events of the intervention proceeded from this original assumption of North Korea guilt.

Has responsibility for the Korean war been thereby firmly established? The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy believes that it has not; that the United States acted with unprecedented haste and persuaded the United Nations to do likewise. It takes this position for the following reasons:

## HEAR ONE SIDE

Only one side was heard. No information was requested regarding the North Korean side of the matter; no representative of North Korea was present nor was any arrangement made for hearing their side of the dispute. No effort was made to ascertain the facts. And all of this in spite of the knowledge that several hours before North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel, the North Korean radio had broadcast news of an offensive by the South Koreans and had warned of stern countermeasures unless South Korea suspended "their adventurous military actions."

No court of law would render a verdict on the kind of one-sided and flimsy evidence advanced in this case by the United States and accepted by the rump session of the Security Council.

The haste with which the American Government, and through its efforts, the United Nations, has condemned North Korea is in startling contrast to the interminable investigations and resulting equivocation with which the Dutch assault on the Indonesian Republic and the Arab attacks upon Israel were treated. This extraordinary haste in the Korean matter must raise the same questions as to the actual motives of the American Government, as did the interminable delays it engineered in the cases of Indonesia and Israel.

The manner in which North Korea has been branded as the aggressor by the Western World under United States initiative makes the case an unconvincing one. It is not necessary that the American people believe the North Korea version in order for them to appreciate the irresponsible haste and total disregard of the most elemental rules of justice employed by our own Government.

In the nature of the Korean case, what most Americans regard as direct evidence will for a long time be unavailable and perhaps unobtainable. A great deal of weight must therefore be placed upon the circumstances in which the Korean war broke out, upon what, in a court of law, is called circumstantial evidence. Of such evidence there is an abundance, but nearly all of it is being suppressed or concealed by the American press and radio and, instead, the Government of South Korea, which until recently was roundly denounced as a corrupt and ineffective puppet of American policy, is now being heralded as an arsenal of Far Eastern democracy.

Aggressive declarations by those whom American power put in charge of South Korea have given the world frank and full warning of what has now taken place. Consider, for example, the following:

In December 1946 Syngman Rhee declared: "On returning to Korea I advocated unification to make the world think we were united, so that we could drive the Russians from the north. America is our friend. \* \* \* We must fight those who are not our friends. As soon as the time comes I'll instruct you. Then you should be prepared to shed blood." He added: "I have already made connections abroad."

Yun Chi Yong, former Minister of Home Affairs and vice speaker of the South Korean National Assembly, told a press conference on March 9, 1949, following

a consultation with the United Nations Commission in Korea: "What was discussed with the U. N. Commission is that peaceful unification of South and North Korea is nothing more than a political plot. The only way to unify South and North Korea is for the Republic of Taehan to regain the lost land in North Korea by force."

TRIBUNE DISPATCH

On August 5, 1949, a dispatch from Allen Raymond in the New York Herald Tribune said: "The one outstanding thing about the South Korean army, now it has been purged several times of Communist infiltrators, is its outspoken desire to take the offensive against North Korea. It wants to cross the border. Its best officers are Japanese-trained professionals, with a fine frosting of American Army training."

On November 1, 1949, the New York Herald Tribune carried a UP interview with Sihm Sung Mo, South Korean Defense Minister, which said: "Referring to the readiness of his troops to drive into North Korea, Mr. Sihm expressed confidence that they could wrest control from the Communists. 'If we had our own way, we would, I'm sure, have started up already,' he told a press conference. 'But we had to wait until they (American Government leaders) are ready. They keep telling us, 'No, no, no; wait. You are not ready. \* \* \*' We are strong enough to march up and take Pyongyang (the northern capital) within a few days.'"

On March 2, 1950, according to the New York Times, President Syngman Rhee told the Korean people that despite advice given by "friends from across the sea" not to attack the "foreign puppets" in North Korea, the cries of "our brothers in distress" in the north could not be ignored. "To this call we shall respond," he said. "The statement contained in a Korean independence day speech," says the Times, "was one of the most outspoken in recent months of a desire to unify the country, if necessary, by force."

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did you ever meet a Chinese Communist delegate named Tung Pi Wu?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever have a meeting with Tung Pi Wu in New York City at which the purposes of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern policy were discussed?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did you write a letter to subscribers protesting the fact that your organization, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, had been forced to register as a subversive organization?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. I show you a photostat of a letter which purports to be such and ask you if you wrote that letter. It bears the signature of Maud Russell.

(A document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. MORRIS. Is that your signature, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read that letter in the record at this time?

(The letter, which was read in full by Mr. Mandel was later ordered into the record as exhibit No. 141 and reproduced on p. 335, with the remainder of the contents of the 6-page pamphlet following as exhibit No. 141-A).

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that letter, together with the other two pages that appear on this little pamphlet, go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. Very well. It will be so ordered.

Mr. MORRIS. We have asked the witness to identify it as her signature, and she has claimed her privilege under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Madam Witness, I notice you are taking notes there. And while you are writing, I wonder if you would favor me by giving me your signature, please, just on a blank piece of paper.

(The witness signs her name on a card and hands it to the chairman.)

Senator WELKER. Thank you very kindly.

This exhibit may go into and be a part of the record. At this time, the signature of Maud Russell as just given to me will be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. MORRIS. Immediately after the last exhibit, Senator?

Senator WELKER. Very well. That is where it will be.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)



## EXHIBIT 119

103 West 93rd Street  
New York 25 New York

To my friends -

I think you will be interested - and concerned - over the fact that the Attorney General, Herbert J. Brownell, Jr., has filed a petition with the Subversive Activities Control Board asking that Board to require The Committee For A Democratic Far Eastern Policy to "register" as a subversive organization. The Committee went out of existence on September 1st 1952 but the legal papers directed to the Committee were mailed to me as the former Executive Director.

The substance of the petition is set forth in the accompanying statement. My attorney advises me that the Government has no legal right to cite an organization no longer in existence. However, I have had to retain an attorney to uphold this point. Unless this petition is challenged it will be granted by default, with possible penal consequences to me personally.

The expenses involved in this legal procedure and in making the facts known to friends have so far been borne by myself. I think it is important to make a fight on this matter at this time when there is a growing conviction that the American public is on the verge of losing sight of the real meaning of freedom.

One of these losses is China trade. People are seeing this as helping ease the terrifying recession while the Administration still treats advocacy of normal trade relations with China as "subversive". But the pressures for trade grow daily!

Another is the people's civil rights. After my recent seventh-annual cross-country speaking trip I can say, with sadness, that the grass roots are fed up with the unAmerican McCarthyism and are more and more ready to resist and defy those thieves of our rights.

My fight on this matter of "registration" is a part of the gathering popular awareness of the issues and the increasing defiance of the un-Americans. Every issue on which we fight together brings nearer the day when we shall have a democratic, peaceful and prosperous America. So I ask you to share in my carrying on this fight on this matter.

Any contribution you can make will be appreciated!

Sincerely,

*Harold Russell*  
Harold Russell

## EXHIBIT No. 141-A

President Truman in his message of September 22, 1950, vetoing the McCarran Act said:

"The application of the registration requirements to the so-called Communist-front organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press, and assembly since the alien and sedition laws of 1798 \* \* \* The bill would open a Pandora's box of opportunities for official condemnation of organizations and individuals for perfectly honest opinions which happen to be stated also by the



Communists \* \* \* Since no one can be sure in advance what views were safe to express, the inevitable tendency would be to express no views on controversial subjects."

The McCarran Act was passed over President Truman's veto. It is McCarthyism in legal form. Can anyone deny that this attempt to terrorize the American people into silence on any issue considered controversial by the McCarthyites has curtailed the people's right of free speech? These last years have offered abundant and bitter proof of the cynical claim that an attack on the constitutional rights of the Communists would not endanger the rights of the whole people is one of the facets of the big lie. The furious onslaught of the McCarthyites against such figures as Bishop Oxnham, Harvey O'Connor, James Wechsler, Mrs. Paul Robeson, Corliss Lamont for any degree of dissent from the views of McCarthy, has amply exposed this illusion. Teachers, students, writers and publishers, editors, clergymen, farmers, scientists, trade-union leaders, artists and entertainers, leaders of the Negro people, and the foreign born are hounded by the FBI, pilloried in the headlines, fired from their jobs, made objects of suspicion among their neighbors, jailed and deported on the charge of what they think or are suspected of thinking. Nonconformity has become a crime as the McCarthyites, McCarrans, Jenners, and Veldes and those whom they represent seek to impose on our country what Justice Douglas has called a black silence of fear. The rights of all Americans are under attack.

But a strong wind of opposition is gathering. Each passing day witnesses more Americans seriously questioning a foreign policy which supports and uses the reactionary, feudal-minded cliques led by Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Bao-Dai who scheme to preserve their oppressive outworn regimes through involving the American people not only in civil wars but even in world war. Increasingly the American people are understanding, and are expressing their opposition to a policy which is proving incapable of creating stability in the Far East and which directly endangers world peace. It is this growing opposition to a bankrupt policy that the administration seeks to silence in its attacks on the organizations of the people.

Yes, the people are beginning to react with vigor. National conventions of the AFL, CIO, the railroad brotherhoods, and independent unions have condemned the McCarran Act. The American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, the NAACP, the American Jewish Congress, the Episcopal League for Social Action, the Presbyterians, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, the American Association of University Professors, the Bar Association of New York, the National Farmers Union, and a sizable and growing list of other organizations are on record against the McCarran Act. The New York Times saw fit to make the Commager article on the "right to associate" its lengthiest article in the magazine section on November 8, 1953.

Those who have a special interest in Asia and our country's far eastern policy will appreciate how this attempt of the administration to order even a nonexistent organization such as the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy "to register" strikes at the right of all Americans to participate in the formulation of our country's foreign policy. This order seeks to deny or destroy our right to be heard on the overriding issue of our day, the issue of war or peace.

Of course, I am going to fight to the limit of my time, energy, and money; this is a part of my citizenship commitment.

You too can go on fighting for the right to have your say about foreign policy:

(a) By letting President Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell, and Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Thomas J. Herbert (their addresses are Washington, D. C.), hear your protest against this unconstitutional attack not only on a nonexistent organization, but even more basically, on the American people's traditional and lawful right of freedom of belief.

(b) By urging your Senators and Congressman to support the repeal of the McCarran Act.

As former executive director of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy I have had to secure legal assistance (attorneys in Washington, D. C.) to challenge the validity of this order to a defunct organization to register; otherwise the issue could be decided adversely by default, and with possible penal consequences for me personally.

While this statement is sent you primarily as a political document to acquaint you with a concrete instance of how our constitutional rights are being jeopardized, I am also asking you to help:

(c) By sharing in some of the financial burden of meeting and resisting this un-American action of the Attorney General.

MAUD RUSSELL,  
103 West 93d Street, New York, N. Y.

(The card on which Miss Russell wrote her name was marked "Exhibit 142" and was placed in the committee files. A reproduction of the signature appears below:)

## EXHIBIT 142



Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I offer you a photostat of a letter on the letterhead of the Far East Reporter, 112 West 42d Street, New York 36, N. Y., Maud Russell, publisher, dated November 20, 1952, bearing the signature, "Maud Russell, Far East Reporter publisher."

I ask if you will look at that, Miss Russell.

Is that your signature thereon, Miss Russell?

Mr. REIN. May we have a moment?

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, yes. Go ahead.

Miss RUSSELL. I admit it.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Mandel, will you read the letter, please?

Mr. MANDEL. "111 West 42d Street," on the letterhead of the Far East Reporter, dated November 20, 1952, "Maud Russell, publisher."  
"To Spotlight subscribers and friends"—

Mr. MORRIS. What is "Spotlight," Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. If you read that, you would see. It tells on it; doesn't it?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, our information leads us to believe that you have a more intimate knowledge of Spotlight than is available to the committee, and we are wondering if you would add to our store of information on that subject.

Miss RUSSELL. It is a publication that I issue, presenting facts and analyses of developments in the Far East.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Is that still in existence?

Miss RUSSELL. It is still in existence. I should say so.

Mr. MORRIS. Read it, please.

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy is no longer in existence, after completing 7 full years of activity geared to informing and mobilizing American public opinion on the issues of our country's relationships with the Far East. Its work has served to prepare the way for the current emphasis on far eastern policy which many organizations now make a major part of their action programs.

Making available specialized far eastern material remains, however, as important as ever—if not more so. I shall accordingly, continue working on this matter of information. Twenty-six years of residence and work in China gave me a concern over American-Asian relations and a compelling sense of citizenship obligation. And my 6 annual speaking trips across our rich and beautiful land, covering to date over 125,000 miles, assure me that the American people are concerned over happenings in Asia, are eager for facts, and want peaceful and beneficial relations with the half of the world that lives in Asia.

So, I propose to continue writing and to make available as widely as possible facts and analyses by other writers on the Far East on developments in the Far East which touch upon the interests of the American people. About ready

for early issue are a series of brochures on the new China, a pamphlet on Japan, and a pamphlet on India.

All paidup subscriptions to Far East Spotlight will be honored as subscriptions to Far East Reporter which will be published by me and which will strive to maintain the high standard of usefulness set by Far East Spotlight. I hope you will become (if you are not) a subscriber and enlist others to subscribe.

I shall continue to be available for talks, about which I enclose details. If my speaking schedule has not included your area or your organization I shall be pleased to receive an initial invitation.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL,  
*Far East Reporter Publisher.*

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Miss Russell, do you publish both the Far East Spotlight and the Far East Reporter at this time?

Miss RUSSELL. I publish Far East Reporter. I made a mistake in answering you before. I used the word "Spotlight." That is incorrect. I publish Far East Reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. This letter would indicate that the Far East Reporter has taken over the function of the Far East Spotlight. Is that right?

Miss RUSSELL. To some extent. I mean, as the Far East Spotlight tried to bring facts and information to people, I continue to want to bring facts and information about the Far East. It has somewhat the same—

Senator WELKER. Miss Russell, I am not quite clear. You want to testify that at one time you did publish the Far East Spotlight, and you no longer do that, and you publish this—

Miss RUSSELL. I did not say that. I say I now publish Far East Spotlight—Reporter.

Senator WELKER. I notice you are about as confused about that as I am. Now, let us see if we cannot get it clear.

Miss RUSSELL. I am not confused.

Senator WELKER. What did you publish immediately prior to Far East Reporter, if anything?

Miss RUSSELL. I published nothing.

Senator WELKER. Did you have any activity in publishing anything?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy terminate its activities, as the last exhibit indicated, on September 1, 1952?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you are, however, the publisher of Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. I am the publisher of Far East Reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Miss Russell, what happened to the records of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do the files of the Far East Reporter contain materials that were taken from the organization, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Is the Far East Reporter the successor organization of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.



Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I wonder if you will tell us the source of revenue for the Far East Reporter.

Miss RUSSELL. I have subscribers. I make an appeal to my subscribers for additional funds to help enlarge my printing. I do public speaking 8 or 9 months of the year. I sell literature, both my own publications and others. Those are the sources, and then the meetings, you know, to raise—speaking meetings.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, where—

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, counsel.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You say you do public speaking about 8 or 9 months out of the year. Would you mind telling the committee where you have spoken?

Miss RUSSELL. I speak around the country.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Let us go throughout the country and find out where you have spoken.

Miss RUSSELL. From Florida to California. I speak in the South, in the Middle West, the Far West, and throughout the country.

Senator WELKER. Have you spoken in every State in the Union, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I would like to brag that I have, but I can't.

Senator WELKER. Well, can you think of the States you have not spoken in?

Miss RUSSELL. No, I can't think of them, offhand.

Senator WELKER. You have spoken in my home State of Idaho, have you?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator WELKER. What part?

Miss RUSSELL. Various parts.

Senator WELKER. Well, would you mind telling me?

Miss RUSSELL. (No response.)

Senator WELKER. Perhaps the names have slipped you. Maybe I can help you. Have you ever spoken in the northern part of Idaho, say at Coeur d'Alene, or Wallace, or Kellogg, or Craigmont, Grangeville, or Lewiston?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges. But thank you for the suggestions.

Senator WELKER. Now, ma'm, you have told me that you have spoken in Idaho. Then I have tried to ask you where you spoke in Idaho, and you put on the cutoff valve for some reason. Now, I believe your able counsel will agree with me that you opened up the subject matter, and I have a right to interrogate you on where you spoke in Idaho.

Now, I am ordering and directing you to answer the question as to where you spoke in Idaho.

(Witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I have spoken in Coeur d'Alene, Kellogg, Boise, and 3 or 4 places around there.

Senator WELKER. You say some places around there?

Miss RUSSELL. Around Boise, Idaho. I don't recall the names just now. If I had a map, I could.

Senator WELKER. Would Pocatello be one, or Idaho Falls or Twin Falls or Nampa or Caldwell?

Miss RUSSELL. Nampa, Caldwell—

Senator WELKER. You have spoken in Nampa or Caldwell. And under what auspices did you speak in Nampa or Caldwell or Boise?

Miss RUSSELL. Far East Reporter.

Senator WELKER. Far East Reporter.

Who sponsored your meeting there?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You claim your privileges under the fifth amendment as to who sponsored your meeting?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Since we have gone into the subject matter of these meetings, I think you have opened up the matter, and I am going to order and direct you to answer who sponsored your meetings at these places.

(Witness consults with her attorney.)

Miss RUSSELL. I stick to my claim of privilege.

Senator WELKER. You stick to your claim of privilege.

Now, would you mind telling me about the size of your audiences in Idaho? Are they large or small?

Miss RUSSELL. They vary from 400 down to 25 or so.

Senator WELKER. Where did you have a meeting of the size of 400 in the State of Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Did you speak in public buildings or church buildings, or did you hire a hall?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege.

Senator WELKER. I wish you would not. I am quite interested in my State, and I would like to know where you can get audiences of 400 people.

Who helped you arrange for these meetings in the State of Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Were they Idaho citizens or people from New York?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Had you ever met any of the people who were sponsors of your meeting prior to coming to the State of Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You do not want to leave any inference that the people who sponsored you in the State of Idaho were not honorable and upright people, do you? I cannot see your invoking the fifth amendment on that unless it might really tend to incriminate you.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Have you told me all the places you have spoken in Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. As far as I remember.

Senator WELKER. Was any advertising gotten out on behalf of your appearances in the State of Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know.

Senator WELKER. That would be handled by someone else, would it, prior to your arrival?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know.

Senator WELKER. You do not know.

Just how do you set up meetings, whether it be in Idaho, Florida, Alabama, or North Dakota? Would you mind telling me that? You certainly just do not go in there without an announcement; do



you? Who handles the announcements and publicity prior to your speaking?

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privilege.

Senator WELKER. You claim your privilege under the fifth amendment?

MISS RUSSELL. That is right.

Senator WELKER. And if you told who did the advertising or the sponsoring of your meetings in the State of Idaho or any of the other States that you have appeared in, a truthful answer to that might tend to incriminate you?

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Do you know any members of the Communist Party in the State of Idaho?

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Do you know any members of the Communist Party in the United States?

MISS RUSSELL. The same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record the letterhead of the Far East Reporter dated January 1955.

Mr. Mandel, would you read the contents of that paper into the record, please?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

*To Far East Reporter Subscribers and Friends:*

MAY 1955.—The ninth annual cross-country speaking trip begins in March and is roughly as follows: Southern area, March and April, beginning in Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, District of Columbia; Ohio and Michigan, month of May; Chicago area, first half of June; Middle West area, Wisconsin and Minnesota, second half of June and early July; North and South Dakota, Montana, northern Idaho, July; northwest, August, Washington and Oregon; California, September; en route eastward, month of October, southern Idaho, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Missouri, Idaho, Chicago area; November, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Speaking arrangements, details and suggested topics are outlined on the accompanying card. If my speaking schedule has not previously included your area, I would be pleased to receive an initial invitation, and from all old and new friends I will appreciate an early indication of whether and when you may want me.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. It may.

Mr. MORRIS. I offer you another letterhead, Mr. Mandel, dated January 1953. Will you read that into the record, please?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

DEAR FRIENDS: 1953 is already well started and it is time to begin to plan for my annual cross-country speaking trip. I expect to leave New York and be on my way about the end of March, with time allowed for some weeks in the South. Then, as usual—

Chicago area—later half of April

Michigan and Ohio—month of May

Minnesota, Wisconsin and South Dakota—month of June

North Dakota, Montana, Idaho—first half of July

Washington and Oregon—last half of July and first half of August  
 California—last half of August and first half of September  
 En route eastward, Chicago, etc.—last half of September and early October.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, are these accurate descriptions of your 1953 and 1955 speaking tours?

Miss RUSSELL. They are.

Mr. MORRIS. Roughly, how many lectures do you make a year?

Miss RUSSELL. Well, when I am in the field I do one about every other day.

Mr. MORRIS. That would be 150 or 160 a year?

Miss RUSSELL. Somewhere around there.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the actual lecture fee for your talks?

Miss RUSSELL. I ask a minimum of \$10. Sometimes I get \$50 or \$100, it runs \$15, \$20, \$25.

Senator WELKER. In addition to your expenses, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. Expenses come out of that.

Senator WELKER. Come out of the \$10?

Miss RUSSELL. Out of my speaking fee.

Senator WELKER. You get a fee of \$10, and your expenses come out of your fees?

Miss RUSSELL. That is right. It is not like a senatorial expense account. I cover about 25,000 miles on \$800, including all expenses. I wish the Senators could match it.

Senator WELKER. I wonder if you could go a little deeper into your own expense account. Outside of your motel, your automobile, gasoline, and so forth, what other expenses do you have?

Miss RUSSELL. You mean travel expenses?

Senator WELKER. I mean any expenses that you might have in making your appearance. Do you pay for billboard advertising, radio spots or television spots?

Miss RUSSELL. No. I get on the radio free.

Senator WELKER. You get on the radio free? Can you tell me where you appeared on the radio free in Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. Not Idaho, no.

Senator WELKER. Why didn't you appear on the radio in Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. Nobody asked me.

Senator WELKER. Nobody asked you. They asked you in all these other places, did they?

Miss RUSSELL. I did not say in all of the places.

Senator WELKER. Where did they ask you to appear on the radio free?

Miss RUSSELL. I have spoken in Oakland and Berkeley and Portland.

Senator WELKER. Now, under whose auspices did you speak in Oakland?

Miss RUSSELL. As an individual, as a publisher of Far East Reporter.

Senator WELKER. As an individual. On some of these trips you must have undoubtedly lost money. For instance, on a long trip, say, from Coeur d'Alene down to Nampa or Boise in the State of Idaho, you couldn't drive that for \$10.

Miss RUSSELL. Well, I don't count each individual trip, I count the year's trips.

Senator WELKER. I am speaking now about individual trips. Did you lose money on any of your appearances in Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. As I say, I don't count it that way, I count my whole year.

Senator WELKER. I don't care what you are counting, I am asking you whether or not you lost money on your appearances in the State of Idaho. That is a prelude to another question I desire to ask you later.

Miss RUSSELL. Well, the first year I went to southern Idaho, I did lose money, I mean it cost me more to get there. But the second year I had so many speaking dates that it was worth while making the investment in the first year.

Senator WELKER. And have you related to me all the speaking dates this second time you appeared in Idaho, as best you can remember? I realize that is rather hard to do.

Miss RUSSELL. I indicated, with help, some of the places where I spoke.

Senator WELKER. Now, in the places where you lost some money on your expenses in Idaho, did anybody repay you for that loss?

Miss RUSSELL. They did not.

Senator WELKER. And you still don't want to tell me what committee organized your appearances in the State of Idaho, what individual or committee arranged for your appearances? Naturally you couldn't do so if you were traveling.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment. But I want to point out that when I traveled—

Senator WELKER. Now, if you claim your privileges under the fifth amendment that about answers it. I don't desire any speech.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may those last two exhibits go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits 143, 143-A, and 143-B," and are as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 143

#### FAR EAST REPORTER

Maud Russell, publisher

MAKING AVAILABLE SIGNIFICANT FACTS AND ANALYSES CONTRIBUTED BY  
COMPETENT WRITERS ON THE FAR EAST

NEW YORK 17, N. Y., January 1955.

*To Far East Reporter Subscribers and Friends:*

My 1955—the ninth annual—cross-country speaking trip begins in March, and is roughly as follows:

Southern area: March and April.

Beginning in Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, North and South Carolina,  
District of Columbia.

Ohio and Michigan: Month of May.

Chicago area: First half of June.

Middle West area:

Wisconsin and Minnesota: Second half of June and early July.

North and South Dakota, Montana, northern Idaho: July.

Northwest: August.

Washington and Oregon.

California: September.

En route eastward: Month of October.

Southern Idaho, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Missouri, Idaho. Chicago area: November.

Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Speaking arrangements, details, and suggested topics are outlined on the accompanying card.

If my speaking schedule has not previously included your area, I would be pleased to receive an initial invitation.

And from all—old and new friends—I will appreciate an early indication of whether and when you may want me.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL.

---

EXHIBIT No. 143-A

FAR EAST REPORTER

Maud Russell, publisher

MAKING AVAILABLE SIGNIFICANT FACTS AND ANALYSES CONTRIBUTED BY COMPETENT WRITERS ON THE FAR EAST

NEW YORK 36, N. Y., *January 1953.*

DEAR FRIENDS: 1953 is already well started and it is time to begin to plan for my annual cross-country speaking trip. I expect to leave New York and be on my way about the end of March, with time allowed for some weeks in the South. Then, as usual:

Chicago area: Latter half of April.

Michigan and Ohio: Month of May.

Minnesota, Wisconsin, and South Dakota: Month of June.

North Dakota, Montana, Idaho: First half of July.

Washington and Oregon: Last half of July and first half of August.

California: Last half of August and first half of September.

En route eastward, Chicago, etc.: Last half of September and early October.

This is the rough "schedule." I would like, now, to begin to fill in some of the details. Can you now make any definite "engagements" for the time allotted to your area? Even to have a few definite dates will give a framework to travel plans. I enclose a card giving details of speaking arrangements—and I again suggest that to think and plan in terms of "gatherings" rather than the more formal "meetings" is probably more realistic in these times.

Some of the possible topics for talks or discussions are:

China Begins Her First 5-Year Plan

The New China

China Forges Ahead as a Modern Power

China as a World Peace Factor

Sino-Soviet Relations

Asian Factors in the World Peace Struggle

What's Happening in Asia?

The Korean War—and Us

China and Her Asian Neighbors

India

Education in New China

Culture in the New China

and there may be particular aspects of the Far East and/or American relations with Asia that you will want to have presented or discussed.

If my speaking schedule has not previously included your area or your organization I shall be pleased to receive an initial invitation.

I will much appreciate an early response.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL.



## EXHIBIT No. 143-B

MAUD RUSSELL

Publisher, Far East Reporter

MAKING AVAILABLE SIGNIFICANT FACTS AND ANALYSES CONTRIBUTED BY COMPETENT  
WRITERS ON THE FAR EAST

\$1 Yearly

## SPEAKER ON THE FAR EAST

Twenty-six years' residence (1917-43) and work (with the YWCA) in China, followed by over a decade working on United States-Asian relations and speaking throughout the United States.

## SPEAKING ARRANGEMENTS

*Available*

For meetings and gatherings, large or small, public or in homes.

*Fees*

To cover travel costs and aid in publication of material on Far East.

Suggested minimum of \$10 for groups up to 30; \$5 for each additional 10 persons. Larger fee or collection or contribution for printing appreciated.

*Cross-country tour*

New York to Pacific coast, April to November.

*December-March*

New York and east coast area.

*Travel*

By car—so no necessity to meet train, bus, or plane.

*Accommodation*

Provided locally where possible, please.

## SOME SUGGESTED TOPICS

## New China (The People's Republic of China)

## In General

## In Detail (separate talks)

Political Aspects

Economic Aspects

Cultural Aspects

Achievements So Far

Workers in China

Farmers in China

Women in China

China Trade Facts: Why Can't Americans Benefit?

China and Her Asian Neighbors

China, Factor for World Peace

Should We Recognize China?

Sino-Soviet Relationships

The Struggle in Indochina

Asian Factors for World Peace

The People's Upsurge in Japan

Japan and the United States

Whither Korea?

India and Nehru's Role

United States-Pakistan Issue

What About Formosa?

What's Happening in Asia?

Your Suggestions?

(Far East Reporter, Box 1536, GCS, New York 17.)

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, in connection with the speaking tours described in those two letters which you have acknowledged are an accurate description for the years 1953 and 1955, did you make any



prearrangements with Communist Party members in the various States with respect to any lecture?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what is the source of news for the Far East Reporter? What is your source of news?

Miss RUSSELL. Well, I read 5 or 6 newspapers a day—the New York Times, the Daily Worker, the New York Herald Tribune, the People's World, the Wall Street Journal—and then if there is something special on, you know, I pick up the other papers.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have any correspondents, say, in occupied China?

Miss RUSSELL. And in addition to that, I have many magazines like the U. S. News and World Report, the Nation, and I get material from those on the Far East. But I make a point, in talking, to quote only from material that is available to anybody in the United States, you know, the current magazines and newspapers. There is plenty of information in them.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, do you have a foreign correspondent or any other source of information in Red China?

Miss RUSSELL. I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you receive any news reports from any individual in Red China?

Miss RUSSELL. I get news reports that are available to everybody.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. But you have no actual correspondent abroad?

Miss RUSSELL. I have friends—I don't have any correspondents as a Far East reporter, I have friends who write me personal letters.

Mr. MORRIS. Are those letters that they write you, are they a source of news for the Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. Well, there is nothing that I ever had from them that I used, I mean, any information I had has come from public sources.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask a question. As I understood you, Miss Russell, you stated that you made your speeches based upon information you acquired from newspapers and magazines that anyone can acquire here in the United States. Do you make any of your speeches based upon information furnished you by the Daily Worker and the People's World, the Communist publications?

Miss RUSSELL. As I said, I take a wide spread of news.

Senator WELKER. All right. Do you make any of your speeches based upon information found in the Daily Worker, the People's World, or any other Communist publication?

Miss RUSSELL. No, I do not make speeches based upon their news. I may use an item that appears—for instance, the paper in San Francisco, the People's World, often has a UP or AP dispatch about specific things about the Far East that does not appear in all the news that I read on the east coast. Of course, I use that.

Senator WELKER. How about the Daily Worker?

Miss RUSSELL. Very seldom does that have anything in it that isn't more fully—I think never has anything that isn't more fully set forth in a paper like the Times or the Tribune. I think I could say a pretty clear no, I don't use the material from the Daily Worker, I read it to see what they have got in it in case they do have something, but I depend mainly upon much fuller sources of information which appear in the magazines and the regular press.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I ask you if you will look at that paper which Mr. Arens has there. Do you recognize that document?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This document has a folder which carries the following legend:

Letters from China. Condensed from private newsletters and personal correspondence originating in China. Due to conditions, names of writers must remain anonymous.

Distributed by: Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 111 West 42d Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this for the record.

Senator WELKER. It may be made a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 144" and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 144

#### LETTERS FROM CHINA

(Footnotes are those of the publisher)

Condensed from private newsletters and personal correspondence originating in China. Due to conditions, names of writers must remain anonymous. Distributed by: Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 11 West 42d Street, New York 18, N. Y. No. 4. 25 cents per copy, \$2 10 issues. January 1949.

#### EXCERPT FROM AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER LETTERS

Due to the rapidly changing conditions in China we have not received new letters for several months. The material below is taken from letters written several months ago but which have not been published before and which have an important bearing on current events.

#### MILITARY SITUATION

##### *Summary of 3 years of civil war*

July 1948 marked the third year of China's civil war. The occasion was marked with a great silence on most fronts which competent observers identified as the lull before the storm.<sup>1</sup> Behind-the-line activity, however, was proceeding at a feverish pace as both sides prepared for new battles. It is calculated that once fighting begins it will last for 5 or 6 months. And the coming battles may well decide the final outcome of the Kuomintang-Communist struggle.<sup>2</sup>

As the training of soldiers and the stockpiling of materials proceeds, the generals review and plan. Their analysis of the situation at the end of the third year of war is very close to what is described below.

It is an established fact that the past year has been a successful one for the Communists. In the first place the liberated areas were increased from 2,100,000 square kilometers in 1947 to 2,355,000 square miles in July 1948. This represents an area of about 25 percent of China which has a population of 170 million or 38 percent of the population of the whole country.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, the strategic positions of the Communists have vastly improved during the past year.

<sup>1</sup>The storm broke with the beginning of the Communist fall offensive in September. By October 30 the Communists had captured Mukden. Chiang's powerful 300,000-man Manchurian army (American trained and equipped) was trapped in the Mukden-Yingkow corridor. One week later the vital port of Yingkow also fell to the Communists.

<sup>2</sup>Even before the fall of Suchow, Henry Lieberman wrote: "The position of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Government—militarily, economically, and psychologically—has deteriorated to the point where diplomatic missions here are informing their home capitals of the possibility of a Nationalist collapse within the next few months. The reports are not predictions. They are warnings of clearly apparent danger signs" (New York Times, October 31, 1948).

<sup>3</sup>These figures were, of course, estimated long before the present central China Communist offensive, and since that time considerable territory, embracing millions of people, have fallen to the Communists.

Generals Liu Po-cheng, Chen Keng, and Chen Yi are in charge of central China. Here they have built up a liberated area bordered on the north by the Lunghai Railway, on the south by the Yangtze River, on the east by a line through to Kiangsu, and on the west by a line from Shansi to Ankang. This region embraces 30 million people and is called the central China liberated area.<sup>4</sup>

In the northwest the Communists have recovered almost the entire district known as the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia border region and have established contact directly with the liberated sections on the east bank of the Yellow River.

In the east the Communists recaptured 85 percent of Shantung Province which had been lost to the Kuomintang troops the previous year. The areas between Tsinan and Tsingtao were entirely cleared of Nationalist troops. These victories forged the link between the central China areas and the Hopei Shantung-Honan liberated areas west of the Grand Canal.

The north Kiangsu front has not been a spectacular one, but the Communists have retaken six cities there and reinstated the East Anhwei liberated area. This region lies between the Yangtze and the Hwai Rivers and provides direct communication between the north and central China liberated areas.

Advances were also made in northeast and north China where the Communists now hold approximately 97 percent of the Northeastern and Jehol provinces. In north China, all the important Kuomintang strongholds in the Shansi-Chahar-Hopei liberated area and in the Shansi-Hopei-Shantung-Honan liberated area have been cleaned out. Yen Hsi-shan's stronghold of Taiyuan is the one exception, but this has not held up the amalgamation of these two immense areas into what is now called the north China liberated area.<sup>5</sup>

Looking at a map it will be seen that the Communist areas inside and outside the Great Wall, north and south of the Yellow River are now connected and form one long corridor. This separates the Kuomintang holdings into two isolated regions with a few islands such as Taiyuan in Communist territory.<sup>6</sup>

Thirdly, there has been a significant change in the relative strength of the Kuomintang and Communist-led forces.<sup>7</sup>

In the first year of the civil war (1946-47), the Kuomintang held the initiative, and its armies were attacking on practically every front. They lost their drive, however, in the autumn of 1947. They are still able to initiate an attack at some points and at others can put up a stubborn defense. But in general, the Nationalist troops are now purely on the defensive. They can no longer hold cities against which the Communists believe it worth while to mount an attack.

On the other hand, the Communists who lost 45 important cities in the first year of fighting, recaptured 40 others, and added another 120 cities and towns in the second year of warfare. All of these were former Kuomintang strongholds, and included such important cities as Anshan, the Pittsburgh of Manchuria, Weihsien, Szepeinghai, Manchurian rail and industrial center Shihchiachuang, vital rail and industrial junction south of Peiping. Other cities taken include Yung-cheng, Lingsun, Loyang, and Yenchow. The Communists also took Kaifeng in Honan and Paochi in Shansi, but evacuated both of these a few days later. These

<sup>4</sup> The great nationalist central China fortress of Suchow (Hsueh), defense bastion of Nanking, fell to the Communists on December 2. The Suchow garrison of 250,000 men had been ordered to sally south to save Nanking and rescue Chiang Kai-shek's 2d Army group, totaling about 140,000 men, which was trapped near Suhsien, 50 miles south of Suchow. They were encircled 50 miles southwest of the city and thereafter made no further headway.

<sup>5</sup> The New York Times in a UP dispatch of November 4 said: "Chinese newspapers reported that Communist forces were steadily tightening their grip on Taiyuan \* \* \*. Several suburbs only a few miles from the city were reported already in Communist hands."

<sup>6</sup> Military analyst Max Werner (New York Star, December 5, 1948) gives a more recent estimate of the strength of the combatting armies: " \* \* \* Thus Chiang commands somewhat less than a million troops, the major part of which are now melting away between Suchow and Nanking. The war lords all together may command somewhat more than a million, but their forces are spread thin and isolated from each other. The war lords are neither able nor willing to help Chiang. Nor is there any military cooperation among themselves. General Fu's troops in the Peiping-Tientsin pocket, Marshal Yen Hsi-shan and Gen. Hu Tsung in Shansi are encircled and face annihilation. Gen. Ma Hung Kwei in Ninghsia Province and Gen. Ma Pu Fang in Chinghai Province cautiously do not fight at all. The Communist armies of China now number about 3 million men in their field armies, local militia troops not included. \* \* \* but mere numbers do not reveal that Chiang's adversaries have a tremendous advantage in better fighting power and organization. Secondly, the relationship of forces in China is changing every month, even every week, against Chiang. \* \* \* who is now sinking into the role of a local war lord having military control only over a couple of provinces."



victories proved that the Communist armies, generally regarded as only capable of guerrilla fighting, are also equipped to fight mobile and positional battles.<sup>7</sup>

Fourthly, the Kuomintang armies are growing increasingly weak both numerically and in firepower. The National Defense Magazine, published by the Chinese Ministry of Defense, in its July 4 issue, revealed that "up to May 1948, the Kuomintang troops had diminished from 3.5 million to 2 million, including 1.8 million new recruits who have not received sufficient training and who show signs of low morale due to the inefficient and corrupt manner in which Kuomintang conscription is handled."

At the beginning of the conflict, the Kuomintang armies had 1.6 million rifles and 6,000 heavy guns. They now have only 1 million rifles and 2,100 heavy guns.

In this same period, the Communist armies have increased from 320,000 men to 2.6 million men. Their firepower increased from 160,000 rifles and 6,000 artillery to 1 million rifles and 22,800 artillery. These statistics clearly show how great the shift in fighting strength of the two sides has been.

#### NOTES ON AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN CHINA

##### *Communists on American aid*

Although the Communists are now holding the initiative and superiority of movement and power in the civil war, they are keenly aware of the possible effects of American aid to the Kuomintang. But at the same time they are convinced that although American aid can prolong the war, it cannot save the tottering Nationalist regime in the long run. Shortly before the fall military offensive, a Communist broadcast from the liberated areas declared:

"\* \* \* Since China is such a large country and since the reactionary Kuomintang government has the full support of the American imperialists, it would be impossible for the People's Liberation Army to score a complete military success at one time and at one place. The enemy will not be defeated or put to death by one blow. If they are defeated in one part of China, with the help of the American imperialists they can easily retreat and entrench themselves in another part. But the sole aim of the People's Liberation Army is to crush the reactionary Kuomintang military forces entirely, for no compromise can be reached between a revolutionary force and a counterrevolutionary force. Such being the case, the People's Liberation Army can but pursue the reactionary forces to the end of the earth, until that force is annihilated. This, of course, will require time and will take many stages to accomplish. We hope, therefore, that the Chinese people will fully understand the importance of this and that they will help with all their might and heart to finish this sacred job in 3 to 4 years."<sup>8</sup>

##### *Chiang puts hopes in world war III*

The Chiang government is still convinced that a third world war will take place; if not in 2 or 3 years then not later than 1953 when the American military preparations will be considered complete.<sup>9</sup> Basing the civil-war plans on such beliefs Chiang has decided to fight a gradually retreating campaign.<sup>10</sup> He will attempt to drag out the war for as long a period as possible and will retreat to the south step by step. At the same time while prolonging the war in the north, the Kuomintang forces hope to gain time for rebuilding South China into an arsenal with the help of American money and technicians.

<sup>7</sup> Since the beginning of the fall offensive the Communists have captured 14 major cities and are now threatening Peiping and Nanking.

<sup>8</sup> The belief that the civil war would be prolonged for 3 to 4 years was expressed before the sweeping Communist successes of the last 2 months. By November, the Communist radio declared that President Chiang's Government was "nearing collapse" and "that it would take 1 year to uproot the Nationalist Government, and a longer time to liberate the entire country." New York Times, November 15, 1948.

<sup>9</sup> A similar opinion on Chiang Kai-shek's reliance on another war was expressed by A. T. Steele in the New York Herald Tribune (November 11, 1948): "President Chiang is apparently convinced that a third world war is in the making and that no matter how far back he may be pushed, his stubborn tenacity will ultimately be vindicated."

<sup>10</sup> In desperate appeals for more American aid, Chiang has repeatedly claimed that his victory over the Communists would "avert a third world war." But even the New York Herald Tribune, which has consistently advocated aid to the Kuomintang, is not sure whether Chiang is more anxious to save mankind or himself. An editorial on November 1, 1948, stated: "Chiang said that Communist conquest of Manchuria 'would mean the virtual beginning of another world catastrophe.' But his remedy was an unfortunately familiar one. To avoid a third war it is 'necessary to come to Asia's rescue'; this means the rescue of China, or more particularly of Chiang Kai-shek, and it is the United States which must do the rescuing."



If their plans in the north fail, however, their aim is to fight desperately in central and south China, with the hope that American-Soviet relations would deteriorate to the breaking point.<sup>11</sup>

It should be added that this fits in very well with the American aid program now being prepared for China.<sup>12</sup>

*United States influence on Kuomintang political shifts*

*Bullitt missions to China.*<sup>13</sup>—The American owned and operated China Weekly Review (June 5, 1948) pointed out that "American officialdom has in recent months been interfering in the affairs of the Chinese Government with increasing frequency. The new United States economic aid and the fact that it is to be handled almost entirely by Americans, gives the American government a fairly big stick in Nanking. American support was quite openly given to Gen. Li Tsung-jen in his campaign for the Vice Presidency of the Republic. A similar amount of disapproval was publicly given to Sun Fo and Chen Li-fu."

As a matter of fact, the Review could have added a great deal more to the record of interference which the American Embassy is compiling out here. An important example is Mr. William C. Bullitt's recent visit to China and the air of mystery with which he conducted himself. From what can be gathered, his mission, admittedly for the United States Government, concerned three things:

1. To determine just how much military aid is really needed by the Nationalists to bridge the present gap and finally defeat the Communists.

2. To conduct a preliminary study to determine the feasibility of setting up a Sino-American Headquarters to direct the so-called Communist-suppression campaign.

3. To make a comprehensive study to determine the prospects for American private investment in south China.

It was further revealed that while in the south Mr. Bullitt had several fruitful conversations with T. V. Soong, Governor of Kwangtung Province. Both parties agreed that American funds should be given to Kwangtung Province to build up Whampoa Harbor, develop Hainan Island, and rehabilitate the Canton-Hankow Railway. In return, the Chinese Government would be willing to release part of Hainan Island to the Americans for joint naval and air bases.<sup>14</sup>

*United States may support warlords directly.*<sup>15</sup>—Further news concerning American aid to Nationalist China and which is also connected with Mr. Bullitt, centers around indications that the United States Government might bypass Chiang Kai-shek and give direct military support to such local warlords as Gen. Fu Tso-yi and Ma Pu-fang, one of the Moslem generals in the northwest. Mr. Bullitt visited General Fu and the latter requested that all frontline troops be

<sup>11</sup> The loss of Manchuria and the drastic military defeats at Suchow and near Nanking have actually forced the Kuomintang to retreat farther to the south. On November 30, 1948, the New York Herald Tribune reported that "Health Ministry employees were being advised quietly to get ready to move either to Canton or the island of Formosa." And again on December 5 a dispatch from Paris stated "that the Chinese Government planned to establish itself on the island of Formosa if the military situation continued to deteriorate." This report added that Chiang had offered the United States bases on the island in exchange for new aid (New York Times, December 5, 1948).

<sup>12</sup> Although the above statement was written some time ago, the U. S. Government has not changed its policy of aiding the reactionaries in China. The present military crises has brought new appeals for aid from the Kuomintang. Chinese Ambassador Wellington Koo recently submitted a 4-point program to President Truman asking for: (1) Declaration of American support for Chiang-Kai-shek; (2) acceleration of delivery to China of American supplies already authorized by Congress; (3) a military officer to be sent to China (Gen. Douglas MacArthur) "to take over direction of supplying, training, and strategic planning of the Chinese Army"; and (4) a \$3 billion aid program to stretch over a 3-year period (New York Times, December 5, 1948). The American Government has not yet made public its reaction to Koo's proposals, but there are indications that support will continue—whether in the form of aid to Chiang or, in the event of his resignation, to other Kuomintang leaders.

<sup>13</sup> We include this revealing story of Bullitt's 1947 mission to China for it throws some light on his recent (November) equally "mysterious" mission to that country.

<sup>14</sup> Bullitt was again sent to China on November 9, 1948; this time by the congressional watchdog committee. According to the New York Herald Tribune (October 30, 1948), the State Department said that he would investigate "all phases" of American aid to Chiang's government. "It was recalled that he had already testified before congressional committees that he favored immediate speeding up of arms to Chiang and urged that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be sent to China to direct more effective combat of the Nationalists against the Communists."

A. T. Steele (New York Herald Tribune, November 15, 1948) reported that Bullitt was to confer with T. V. Soong on this trip too. He also stated that "there is a strong section of American opinion here that favors Dr. Soong as the man best fitted to take the leadership in any new economic setup that might be established."

<sup>15</sup> For further indications of this move see footnote 25.

American equipped and that this equipment should be sent through Tientsin rather than through Nanking as formerly. There is no positive check, but there has been some leakage to the effect that Bullitt concurred and expressed assurance that such arrangements could be made.

Gen. Ma Pu-fang had similar conversations with an American diplomat in the north while on a visit to the Kansu-Chinghai war areas. He promised to make some recommendations to the American Government immediately.

*Premier Wong Wen-hao.*<sup>16</sup>—Further intervention by American authorities into China's internal affairs took place when the new Premier Wong Wen-hao was elected.

During the period when the Generalissimo was scanning the field for persons whom he might cajole into accepting the premiership, an American official hinted to Chiang that the premier-to-be should have the following qualifications:

- (1) Pro-American and trusted by the Government.
- (2) An honest and capable official who would not waste American dollars.
- (3) A man who could use American aid so effectively that it would immeasurably help the anti-Communist campaign.

After much deliberation and considerable struggle with the "CC clique" which favored Gen. Ho Ying-chin, the Generalissimo selected Wong Wen-hao. Wong had proven his obedience and loyalty to Chiang over a long period of years. This choice was made primarily in line with the American official's suggestion and Wong's main job therefore will be to handle American aid effectively. As one source put it, "Wong's familiarity with American methods will be reflected in the maintenance of good Sino-American relations, particularly at this time when China will depend to the fullest on an efficient administration of the aid program to help bring an end to the civil war."<sup>17</sup>

American observers have said that Wong's appointment "wrote finis to one of the most intense clique conflicts in the history of modern Chinese politics by ending with what was interpreted as a resounding defeat to the CC clique and a victory for the Political Science Group." However, this is an erroneous calculation. The Legislative Yuan, whose majority is in the hands of the CC clique, can either vote Wong out of office or they can put pressure on him to take such action as he may consider incorrect. Consequently, other observers on the scene feel that Wong's cabinet cannot last more than 6 months. In addition to the beatings he will get from the Legislative Yuan he has been forced to fill the Cabinet posts with second- and third-rate people.<sup>18</sup>

### *Peace rumors*

With the accelerated deterioration of the military situation, defeatism became rampant among both Nanking and American circles. This led to renewed peace rumors—some of them wilder than the farcical tales spun for local and international consumption earlier in the year.

One opium pipe concoction had it that Chiang will be compelled by such militarists as Ho Ying-chin and Fu Tso-yi to announce his intention of going abroad and that this would pave the way for peace talks between Vice President Li Tsung-jen and Marshal Li Chi-shen, ousted Kuomintang rebel now residing in Hong Kong. Another rumor consisted of the story that the five northern generals (Li Tsung-jen, Fu Tso-yi, Yen Hsi-shan, Ma Hung-kwei, and Ma Pu-feng) had joined hands and declared their independence of the Central Government so that they could negotiate a separate peace with the Reds.<sup>19</sup>

It appeared as though all of these rumors were part of a large, overall plan. In June the New York Herald Tribune carried an editorial criticizing Chiang Kai-shek, advising that General Li Tsung-jen should be put at the helm and

<sup>16</sup> Wong Wen-hao resigned in November and was replaced by Dr. Sun Fo.

<sup>17</sup> That the selection of Wong did not improve the situation is clearly shown by numerous reports of corruption and deterioration within the Kuomintang regime.

<sup>18</sup> This writer's prediction of the duration of the Premier proved to be correct. Wong Wen-hao was forced to resign his position in November and was replaced by Sun Fo, President of the Legislative Yuan. Dr. Sun Fo, son of the founder of the Chinese Republic, Sun Yat-sen, was appointed by Chiang Kai-shek (New York Times, November 10, 1948). Various press reports have characterized the new Premier as a liberal. But a letter which we received from China last June describing "the Reconstruction Association," a Kuomintang group which is headed by Sun Fo, reveals that he is one of the leaders of the most reactionary elements of the Kuomintang: "This organization is a mixture containing some CC clique people who still remain loyal to Chen Li-fu, such as Pan Kung-chan, Wu Teh-chen, and others. Pan is the head of the Municipal Council of Shanghai and Wu was Minister of Communications. Sun Fo's clique also includes the Kwantung Province warlords, Gens. Chang Fah-kwei and Hsieh Yu and his own men, writer Chung Tien-hsin, and Ni Wen-ya, member of the San Min Chu Yi Corps Executive Committee."

<sup>19</sup> Re Marshal Li-Chi-shen's negotiations with the Communists, see footnote 22.

broadly hinting that the Wong Wen-hao Cabinet should inherit the emergency powers now at the disposal of Chiang.<sup>20</sup> Several weeks later the Associated Press climaxed the rumor drama in a report that some very important personage from Nanking (and all indications pointed to Premier Chang Chun) had conferred with Communist General Chou En-lai somewhere near Peiping. It was reported that during the conference General Chou had put forth the following conditions for the resumption of peace talks:<sup>21</sup>

1. Chiang should be deprived of all power and duties and go abroad.
2. The Chinese armies should be reorganized and put under the command of Communist General Lin Piao.
3. That the job of Premier or Minister of Foreign Affairs should be held by a Communist.
4. Peace talks should be resumed.

#### *Communists on peace rumors*

The Communists hardly gave passing notice to all of this. Because of their cold attitude, it was obvious that they were not in favor of such peace talks.<sup>22</sup>

Therefore, on July 25 Premier Wong issued a statement bitterly denouncing the Communists and calling upon the whole nation to fight them to the end because " \* \* \* the Communist Party is a 5th column for the U. S. S. R. in China."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> New York Herald Tribune, June 18, 1948.

<sup>21</sup> Similar peace rumors persisted through November. On November 7, 1948, the New York Times reported "unconfirmed speculations" that: (1) Gen. Chang Chi-chung "would become Premier and try to make peace with the Communists;" (2) "That President Chiang would go abroad and let Vice President Li Tsung-jen head the government during the peace negotiations;" (3) that "Shao Li-tze or former Premier Chang Chun would head a coalition government without Chiang."

<sup>22</sup> On November 14 the Communist northern Shensi radio broadcast confirmed that Gen. Chang Chi-chung, director of Chiang's headquarters in northwest China, and Shao Li-tze were advocating peace negotiations. It further announced that Vice President Li Tsung-jen, Gen. Pai Chung-hsi, Minister of Defense Ho Ying-chin, and former Premiers T. V. Soong and Chang Chun "had promoted a peace move." "These men are making a bid to force the abdication of Chiang Kai-shek," the Communist radio declared, and added that "this peace movement was contrary to the purpose of the Chinese Communists \* \* \* and is intended to safeguard the interests and spare the influence of the reactionaries" (New York Times, November 15, 1948).

That the Communists are against peace negotiations with die-hard Kuomintang reactionaries was made clear in an earlier Communist broadcast from China on November 10, 1948, which announced that "all high Kuomintang military and political officials would be treated as war criminals." At the same time, however, the Communists continued negotiations with democratic, anti-Kuomintang forces. On October 18, 1948, Marshal Li Chi-shen, chairman of the Kuomintang Revolutionary Committee (headquarters in Hong Kong) announced that his committee had delegated Shen Chun-yu, Chang Po-chung (representatives of the Democratic League which was outlawed by Chiang Kai-shek), Tan Ping-shen and Tsai Ting-kai "to confer in the liberated areas with Communist leaders regarding the calling of a new Political Consultative Conference for the establishment of an All-China Democratic Coalition Government" (see *The Crisis in China*, published by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, New York, November 26, 1948).

<sup>23</sup> While accusing the Communists of plotting to sell China to a foreign power (the U. S. S. R.), the Kuomintang leaders at the same time offered the United States sweeping control within their country in return for increased aid. Early in November it was reported that Nationalist leaders proposed that Shanghai be declared an open or international port (New York Times, November 7, 1948). Immediately following his appointment as China's premier, Dr. Sun Fo declared that "China must be prepared to make any reasonable concession to obtain major American military assistance at the earliest possible moment." According to Dr. Sun, "reasonable concessions" included the following: the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as supreme military adviser in China, and "the reopening of the Yangtze River and other inland waterways to American and other foreign shipping for landing and embarking cargoes. Under certain circumstances, \* \* \* United States Navy forces should be allowed to use inland waters as American military advisers might desire" (New York Times, November 28, 1948).

In sharp contrast to the Kuomintang program, is the statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued on November 21 in reply to the demand of the Nationalists for American military protection:

"The Communist Party of China holds that any military or economic aid to the Kuomintang Government by the Governments of the United States or other countries constitutes an act of hostility against the Chinese Nation and the people of China, and should cease immediately. If the American Government should dispatch its Armed Forces for either all-out or partial protection of the Kuomintang Government, this would constitute armed aggression against the sacred territory and sovereignty of China; all the consequences thereof would have to be borne by the American Government.

"The Communist Party of China, the People's Democratic Governments of China's liberated areas, and the Chinese People's Liberation Army are willing to establish equal, friendly relations with all foreign countries, including the United States of America, and to protect the rightful interests of all nationals of foreign countries in China, including American nationals. But the integrity of China's territory and sovereignty must be preserved without encroachment \* \* \* (The Crisis in China, *ibid.*, p. 7).



Two days later Chiang also denied the peace rumors. He declared openly and with anger that such talk allowed to spread freely would only result in great harm to the morale of the Kuomintang Army.<sup>24</sup>

*Kuomintang blames United States for peace rumors*

An interesting sidelight to this whole dog-biting-at-his-own-tail story was that sections of the Kuomintang began blaming the peace rumors on the Americans. These accusations were detailed in one Kuomintang-affiliated magazine which declared that ever since last winter the Americans were trying to do several things in China.

1. They tried hard to promote Li Tsung-jen to the vice presidency, thereby providing a replacement in leadership if Chiang should be forced to resign.<sup>25</sup>

2. They put Wong Wen-hao and Ho Ying-chin in as premier and minister of defense, respectively, thus forming an alliance to take over Chiang's powers; through these forces they hoped to achieve the political reforms for which they have been pressing.

3. The Americans will sponsor all sorts of organizations which will "voice" support of reorganization and reform of the Kuomintang and the Government.

4. The American Government is supporting directly all those military men who have proved to be efficient—i. e. Generals Fu Tso-yi, Ma Hung-kwei. This reveals the intention of continuing the anti-Communist war in China even if the Generalissimo is defeated on the battlefield. Thus they hope to prevent a Communist dominated China from being an effective ally of the U. S. S. R. in the event of a war between that power and the United States.<sup>26</sup>

5. The Americans are determined to organize south China and Taiwan (Formosa) economically and militarily in order to obtain a foothold in the Asiatic Continent in the event of a third world war.

6. For the past 3 or 4 months, the Americans have, through certain legislators, writers, and scholars repeatedly denounced the Generalissimo.

<sup>24</sup> In November President Chiang again forcefully denied rumors of peace negotiations. On November 9, 1948, the New York Herald Tribune reported that "President Chiang Kai-shek told his followers today to prepare for 8 more years of war against the Chinese Communists. He declared the present peace negotiations rumors following Government military losses were Communist propaganda. Peace, he said, can be attained only by destroying the Communists throughout the nation."

See also Letters from China, June 1948, pp. 5-7, for a detailed account of the election of Li Tsung-jen to the vice presidency and concomitant political conflicts within the Kuomintang.

<sup>25</sup> Last June the Communists denounced Li Tsung-jen as a "puppet who was being groomed by the United States for continuing the civil war" (New York Herald Tribune, June 18, 1948). In the same month one of our letters from China in an analysis of Li's election to the vice presidency, said: "Li Tsung-jen's victory was misconstrued by some elements in China as a success for the liberals. This idea is completely unfounded. Li himself is far from liberal; nor are the men who are closest to him. He does have a few liberal people in his entourage, but they have no voice and no influence" (Ibid., p. 6).

More recently, A. T. Steele of the New York Herald Tribune (November 18, 1948), expressed the belief that "if Chiang \* \* \* should step down from the presidency, the mantle of leadership would fall on the shoulders of Gen. Li Tsung-jen \* \* \*. Whether this would lead to negotiations with the Communists or to a continuance of the present policy of resistance is hard to say. Although General Li is often mentioned as a possible supporter of a coalition government, his public statements have been pretty much on the government line."

On November 10, 1948, the New York Star in a special dispatch from Paris reported that "information from usually trustworthy sources indicates that the United States Government now inclines to the opinion that President Chiang Kai-shek should resign in the interest of his country. It is even reported that this view is being conveyed to the Generalissimo informally."

<sup>26</sup> Since despite the billions of United States dollars given Chiang Kai-shek, Communist military victories have continued at an ever increasing rate, the present near collapse of Kuomintang rule finds United States policy poised on the edge of a double-borne dilemma. That the United States might resort to giving direct aid to some of the feudal warlords has been hinted in the press from time to time. Writing in the New York Times, November 9, 1948, Hansen Baldwin said: "We must search, then, for desperate remedies in China. We may have to support individual provincial governors, or able generals like Fu Tso-yi, commander of the government armies in north China, who are able to rally around them armies capable of holding at least parts of China. In the next few weeks or months so dark is the present situation, we may be faced with some such desperate recourse" (New York Times, November 9, 1948).

And again on November 10, 1948, the New York Herald Tribune reported that ECA Administrator in China Roger Lapham "has recently been in Washington pressing a plan to by-pass Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and to give direct aid to local Chinese forces resisting the Communists. Lapham's main motive is that the north China leader, Gen. Fu Tso-yi, is distrusted by the Generalissimo and has therefore not been supplied very liberally."

See also above for further comments on this view.



In conclusion, this article claimed that the latest peace rumor was solely an American fabrication and that these actions were carried out by the Chinese agents of the United States.

*Communists want peace but not compromise with reaction*

It should be pointed out that this false "peace wave" did have some effect on members of the democratic movement in that it set them wavering. These people thought that the downfall of the Generalissimo would mean the crumbling of the entire Kuomintang setup. Consequently they started a move for a joint declaration demanding the immediate resignation of the President. This declaration was to be signed by a thousand prominent men. However, this movement died as soon as the local governments announced that all participants would be severely punished.

What was obvious to all but these "peace dreamers" was that Chiang is actually the last and the strongest of the reactionary elements in China and that the Chinese revolution cannot be successful if there is compromise with the reactionaries through agreement to oust Chiang and at the same time preserve his mechanism of rule. A look at their own history would provide the evidence for them—especially the failure of the northern expedition of 1925. These people have been warned that such mistakes must not be repeated again.

#### LIVING IN THE LIBERATED AREAS

(Excerpts of letters from William Hinton from Taihang Mountain areas, Shensi Province)<sup>27</sup>

##### *Land reform*

*Division of the land.*—I am now living in a little village on a high plateau in the heart of the mountains. I came here to join in the work of carrying out the land reform. You cannot imagine what great pains are taken to put through this new program. One would think that they would just go out into the fields and divide up the land according to the number of people in the village. But the actual distribution of land is only a small part of the work.

This is a movement to root out feudalism from the Chinese countryside. This means not only doing away with economic exploitation but changing age-old habits of thought and action; mobilizing the people for real self-government and democracy. To teach the peasants to work and build together is a tremendous and slow task. It requires the constant and tireless effort of everyone. And then slowly but surely things begin to change. The economic changes are the first and easiest, but the political changes are slower and harder. Most of the people here already have a fair share of what there is in land, tools, and animals. But now we are laying the foundations for real democracy, made possible by the abolition of exploitation. This is a creative effort of such magnitude as the world has never seen, except perhaps in the early stages of the development of the Soviet Union.

*Determination of class standing.*—The organization of the countryside is carried on in three stages: (1) Bringing together of the poor peasants and hired laborers into the Poor Peasants League; (2) uniting these people with the middle farmers in the Farmers Union which embraces the great majority of the people in the village; (3) establishing the Peasant Congress (out of a committee from the Farmers' Union) which then becomes the legislative and governing body of the community.

But before these organizations are formed, people's committees, chosen from among the most active peasants and workers, must determine the economic status of all the people in the community; who is a poor peasant, a middle farmer, a rich farmer or a landlord. The Communist Party has issued a set of criteria for determining class standing. The people's committees study these instructions and ask each person in the village to report his economic status. On the basis of these reports, the committee then classifies the entire community. The basis for demarcating the class status is the possession of the means of production: the poor peasants and hired laborers have none or too little; the middle farmers have about enough; the rich and the landlords have more than they can themselves use so they exploit the labor of others. The rich farmers and landlords as a class oppose the revolution because they have privileges to protect.

<sup>27</sup> William Hinton, an agricultural missionary, is in China under the United Brethren Mission. He formerly worked with the Office of War Information (United States) in China.

If a man is classed as a rich farmer it means that his surplus property will be taken away from him and distributed to those in need. The middle farmers, on the other hand, will benefit by the abolition of feudalism and they support the revolution. But it is not always easy to draw the line between the rich and the middle farmer and to classify the latter as "rich" will serve to drive him into the enemy's camp.

Thus the utmost care is taken to do justice to everyone. All the peasants in the community report their economic status to the Poor Peasants League which makes up the first classification in the area. This preliminary list is posted in the village together with a special mailbox for objections and criticisms from the people. When the Farmer's Union, composed of both middle and poor farmers and embracing most of the people in the village, is established, the process of classification begins again: once more the people report their economic status, particularly those who were dissatisfied with the first decision and appeal for reclassification. But even the decisions reached by the union are not final. The list and the mailbox are again posted up in the village. After the Peasant Congress is set up, the whole village meets again to pass on reclassifications and the class standing of the people is finally determined. But if there are some who are still dissatisfied, they may appeal to the county government, or even to the border region government.

It is wonderful to see the progress of this work. These peasants, most of whom cannot read or write, achieve a more thorough knowledge of society and sociology than most people—than most postgraduates in America. They are keenly interested in the new development for it concerns their own lives, their neighbors' lives and the future of everyone. How a person is to live—whether he is to receive more land, tools, and animals or continue as before, or have land and property taken away from him—depends on the determination of his class standing in the community. And as I have explained, this very vital question is solved through an almost endless series of meetings and through this process everyone is educated. As the preliminary, temporary committees are replaced and succeeded by others, the people gain a better and better knowledge of how and whom to elect for their permanent officers. In America we sort of assume that if we get a group of people together in a room they can at once elect a representative who would serve them best. This is of course an illusion and the peasants here know it. They hold several, a whole series of elections so that they can watch their candidates in action. Only after these experiences does the community hold final elections for a more permanent governing body.

*Collection of taxes in the countryside.*—Did you ever hear of people deciding by themselves what taxes they should pay to the Government on the basis of their ability to pay? I never have. But things you have never heard about happen here all the time.

In the liberated areas taxes are due after the summer and fall harvests. In the Kuomintang areas no one ever knows how much he will have to pay or when for soldiers are apt to come around whenever the warlord or governor needs funds and take away whatever you have in the house. But in the liberated areas taxes are paid only twice and at the time of year when the grain can most easily be spared. The amount is fixed in various ways (this summer a new tax law came into effect which I have not had time to study) but always the local conditions are taken into consideration. In our village, just before the wheat ripened, a big black cloud came rolling out of the west and plastered the fields with hail. The hailstones were as big as tennis balls—knocked holes in the roofs of houses, stunned men and animals and threshed the wheat as it stood. In 20 minutes an excellent harvest was split upon the ground. The people wept all day openly in the streets and for several days were stunned into inactivity. I saw one man work all afternoon winnowing and sweeping and piling up the straw. When he finished, there was enough wheat to fill only a couple of pails. The real crop remained on the ground in the fields.

This tragedy was reported to the hsien (district) government and at the same time we in the village promised that taxes would be reduced although we could not say by how much for that decision had to be made by the hsien. Several weeks later word came that our village was to pay no taxes at all, while other villages in the same section which suffered less damage were to pay 15 percent less than their usual quota. But at a general meeting of all the villages of our section there were some who protested this decision. It was not fair for Jang Jwang to pay nothing while they paid so much, they said. And we decided that our people would pay a little too. The hsien suggested 20 den for the whole

village (about 2 tons or one-eighth of the regular quota corresponding to the decrease in the yield). Then the question arose as to how this burden should be distributed among the people. We decided on the *dz baw gung ti* (self report, everybody agrees) method. This method allows everyone in the village to speak out at a meeting and say what he believes he can afford to pay and the other villagers discuss his offer. Has he given too much or too little? The amount for payment is fixed only after the individual and the rest of the people agree on the offer made.

Although this sounds like a simple system it is not easy to put into practice. If a man who got a good harvest offers too little, who wants to cross him and earn his ill will by demanding that he pay more? If someone offers too much, who wants to reveal the truth and perhaps be accused of favoring a friend or relative? The problem was to encourage the people to speak out openly and truthfully, to criticize each other and thus to arrive at a true conclusion. The basis of democracy as practiced here is for everyone to participate in making decisions and for everyone to say what he really thinks. That is the difficult part of the work. It is not so hard to get everyone or at least a majority to come to a meeting, but it is difficult to educate the people to speak out frankly and openly.

This kind of training in democracy had just begun in our village; the people were not used to it and our meetings did not go too well. In one group, the man who had the best harvest of all made a low offer and a neighbor suggested he should pay more. He became angry and refused and after that none of the people wanted to speak. Some got discouraged and said "Why don't you just allot quotas to us as before and we'll pay whatever is necessary?" But we answered, "How can we know what quotas would be fair? Do we know your yield? The yield is different this year because of the hail. Who but you and your neighbors can decide a fair payment? Others didn't understand the democratic method. The "*dz baw*" (self report) was clear enough, but the "*gung yi*" (all agree) was not so clear. "I'll make my offer and since we have democracy now its my own business how much I give or don't give," they thought. And so the principles of democracy had to be discussed again. Does a democracy mean doing just as you please? Can you leave your cart in the middle of the road and make others take to the ditch to get past you? Or does the community as a whole have the right to set limits and agree on rules? When 400 men and women discuss questions such as these—not in the abstract, but in the course of deciding the very vital matter of who pays what taxes—everyone learns something, and the whole community moves ahead.

Finally, because everyone was busy in the field, it was decided to let the People's Congress whose 25 delegates had just been elected, to look over the list of offers and "*gung yi*" them. Quotas ranging from none to 4 bushels were allotted and the total for the village came to 21 dan, just 1 more dan than the *hsien* had suggested. But the congress decision was not binding and anyone not satisfied could appeal his case. When the time for actual payment arrived the people were satisfied. Of course, no one likes to pay taxes, but all realized the need of supporting the front (there are 70 soldiers' families out of a total of 235 in Jang Jwang). Since they paid what they could and it was fair, they were happy.

*Policy on commerce and industry.*—Another important problem today is the working out of the policy on commerce and industry. The movement led by the Chinese Communists during the past 20 years has been directed at the destruction of feudalism; not at the destruction of wealth and privilege but of feudal wealth and privilege. It is feudal wealth and feudal society that put fetters on production. The whole aim and *raison d'être* of the Chinese revolution is to clear the ground for an upsurge of production. For only industrialization can bring China into the modern world.

Thus a clear distinction is made between wealth derived from industry and commerce and wealth derived from the ownership and operation of the land. The former is encouraged and helped by the new government but the feudal relationships are uprooted by the force of the revolution. When a large landlord also has industrial and commercial holdings the problem is more complicated. It is not easy for the poor peasant to distinguish between wealth derived from two different sources. When the peasants take possession of his land in the country it seems perfectly natural from them to move on to the town and confiscate the landlord's inn, his shop, or his factory. Such mistakes have been made in the past.



But during the past year tremendous effort has been made to correct such errors. Industrial and commercial holdings (except those belonging to the big-four families or other bureaucratic elements) have been returned to their original owners if previously confiscated, and are protected and encouraged in new areas. Last winter I frequented a bathhouse in the city and discovered that it had a very interesting history which illustrates the new policy. When the city was liberated the workers took possession of the bathhouse because of the ill treatment and low wages which they had received in the past. They ran the business for 2 years and were so successful that the enterprise expanded considerably. Recently the bathhouse was returned to the original owner and he compensated the workers only for the additions which they had constructed. But the owner may no longer set wages and hours to please himself. Working conditions and pay are jointly agreed upon by the owner and the union.

In our village one of the landlords also had a wine distillery. This land, houses, furniture, clothes, and buried wealth (such as silver dollars) as well as the distillery were confiscated and he and his family ran away. Now the plant is being returned to his son (for several members of the family have since died). Thus it is not unusual for refugees in Shanghai and the port cities to receive letters from home offering them their shops and plants and urging them to return as merchants and businessmen even though their land holdings have been distributed.

## ORDER ON THIS FORM

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY,

111 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.:

Enclosed is \$2 for the next 10 issues of Letters From China. Please mail as specified below.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Zone No. \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, do you know the sources of those letters, then? Clearly they are people writing in from Red China, are they not?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I offer you a pamphlet of the Far East Spotlight called Germ Warfare in Korea. I ask if you will look at that pamphlet, please. That is a photostat. Do you recognize that pamphlet?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that a pamphlet that you published?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You are ordered and directed to answer that question.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, what was the source of information that went into the publication of that pamphlet?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read the beginning of that pamphlet, please?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

Millions of Americans heard with incredulity and dismay charges that United States military forces are dropping deadly plague germs on the Korean and Chinese people.

The average American's first thought is that United States forces could not have resorted to such a barbarous weapon. Yet antedating the present charges are facts which deserve consideration.

Mr. MORRIS. Where did you get those purported facts which you published in that paper?



Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, I wonder if you would read the end of that pamphlet, too.

Mr. MANDEL. At the end of the pamphlet are the following requests:

Write President Truman, your Congressmen and Senators urging (1) that your Government support U. N. action on the germ charges; (2) our Government promptly ratify the Geneva protocol barring use of germ warfare. As with the A-bomb, the only real defense against germ warfare is peace. To this end we urge them to support (1) an immediate cease fire in Korea; (2) a meeting of the major powers to negotiate for a settlement of differences.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you have anything to do with the publication of that pamphlet, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I show you an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of December 2, 1948, entitled "What Chiang Has Lost in Arms, Men," and ask you if you will read that, please.

Do you recognize that article, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read a description of that article into the record?

Mr. MANDEL. This is from the Daily Worker of December 2, 1948, entitled "Crisis in China. What Chiang Has Lost in Arms, Men."

The following is the second of four articles on the situation in China prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Mr. MORRIS. Now that article goes on, does it not, Mr. Mandel, to list in great detail a great deal of information about the losses of a Chinese Nationalist Army in China at the time?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record at this time, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 145" and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 145

[From the Daily Worker, December 2, 1948]

#### CRISIS IN CHINA: WHAT CHIANG HAS LOST IN ARMS, MEN

(The following is the second of four articles on the situation in China prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far-Eastern Policy.)

The sweeping victories of the Chinese People's Armies bring closer the end of fascism and civil war in China and the day when she can begin to reconstruct in the interest of all her people.

The present situation also fully justifies the previous warning of all opponents of United States intervention and support to the corrupt, reactionary dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek.

On the other hand it also carries a new challenge because it has already brought pressure by United States reactionaries for more open, direct, armed intervention in China by those backing the oppressive Nanking regime.

Since the opening of the liberation army's fall offensive in the middle of September, Chiang Kai-shek has suffered successive defeats of such magnitude that his Kuomintang regime has been shaken to the roots. Before the offensive, the people's army held only a half-dozen cities. During the offensive it captured:

Place	Population	Description	Liberation
Tsinan.....	700,000	Shantung provincial capital.....	Sept. 24
Linyi.....		Former Communist headquarters in Shantung Province.....	Oct. 12
Chinhhsien.....	150,000	Supply base for Chiang's Manchurian armies.....	Oct. 15
Chefoo.....		Seaport on north Shantung peninsula.....	Do.
Changchun.....	800,000	Capital of Manchuria.....	Oct. 16
Chengchow.....	230,000	Strategic central China railway junction in Honan Province.....	Oct. 23
Paotao.....		Western terminus of Peiping-Suiyuan Railroad.....	Do.
Kaifeng.....	300,000	Capital of Honan Province.....	Oct. 25
Mukden.....	2,000,000	Manchurian industrial center.....	Oct. 30
Yingkow.....		Manchurian seaport.....	Nov. 4
Nanyang.....		Strategic center in Western Honan Province.....	Nov. 7
Chengteh.....		Capital of Jehol Province.....	Nov. 8
Shanhaikwan.....		Historic and strategic gateway from Manchuria into China proper.....	Nov. 9
Tangshan.....		Coal center in east Hopei.....	Nov. 11
Hulutao.....		Seaport in Manchuria which is not icebound in winter.....	Nov. 13
Suhsien.....		Railroad center 125 miles north of Nanking and 45 miles of Suchow.....	Nov. 16
Paoting.....		Capital of Hopei Province.....	Nov. 21

There are three important points in connection with these battles.

Chiang lost top generals:

At Tsinan: General Wang Yao-wu, governor of Shantung, one of Chiang's most able and trusted generals, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang—captured.

At Chinhhsien: General Fan Han-chieh, deputy commander-in-chief of Kuomintang forces commanding United States-trained and equipped mechanized troops—captured.

In the battle for west Liaoning Province, when Kuomintang troops were trying to escape from the Mukden encirclement, the Government's Manchurian commander-in-chief, Gen. Wei Lihuang, was reported arrested by Chiang for insubordination. The commander of the new 6th Army, Gen. Liao Yao-hsiang, described by Gen. Joseph W. Stillwell as one of the most able Chinese commanders, was reported shot for insubordination. Then the story was put out that he had "sacrificed himself heroically in battle." Finally he turned up alive and safe, but as a prisoner of the people's armies.

Kuomintang armies which surrendered were destroyed or deserted:

At Tsinan, the commander of the 96th Army, General Wu Hua-wen, went over to the liberation army with his troops.

At Changchun, the 60th Army revolted. The new 7th Army surrendered without firing a shot.

In west Liaoning, 12 Kuomintang divisions, attempting to escape from Mukden through Jehol Province, were put to rout. More than 70 Kuomintang general officers had been captured by November 2.

In the inconclusive battle of Suchow, the 59th and the 77th armies, formerly commanded by the late Christian Gen. Feng Yu-hsiang, went over to the liberation army. Another two of Feng's former divisions, under Gen. Liu Juming, revolted and went over to the liberation army in the north of Suchow.

Nanking's losses in troops and supplies:

At both Tsinan (Shantung Province) and Chinhhsien (in south Manchuria) Chiang Kai-shek lost most of his crack troops and enormous quantities of American supplies and equipment. His most devastating defeat was in the Mukden area where his powerful 300,000-man Manchurian Army failed to escape to the port of Yingkow for evacuation to the north and central China fronts.

In the first stage of the battle of Suchow, two divisions each from the Kuomintang 13th and 100th Armies were completely destroyed. The 54th and 25th Armies were partially destroyed.

An indication of the amount of supplies captured by the Liberation Army was given in a Peiping dispatch to the New York Times dated November 3.

"Supplies captured by the Communists in Manchuria far surpass all the military equipment that the Nationalists are scheduled to receive under the United States \$125 million military-aid program."

Announcing new purchases of arms for China in Washington on November 1, a United States Government official was quoted by New York Herald Tribune correspondent Fitzhugh Turner, as saying that these "might not make up for

arms and ammunition captured by the Chinese Communists in Manchuria or handed to them over there by Chiang's disintegrating armies."

Chiang can try to hang on to the north China corridor where Gen. Fu Tso-yi is in command. Fu has already asked and been granted power by Chiang Kai-shek to make independent decisions on military and political matters in north China without consultation with Nanking. This can either mean that since Fu has a free hand he can receive arms and supplies direct from United States military authorities without interference by Chiang; or that since militarily he is no position to halt the advance of Gen. Lin Piao's army, he may capitulate without plunging the Nanking regime into further moral deterioration.

In central China, Chiang is making an all-out effort to hang on to Suchow, strategic railway junction about 190 miles south of Nanking where he has concentrated about 400,000 of his best remaining troops and most of his air force. Large-scale Kuomintang victories were reported in the United States press, but on November 24 even the superinterventionist New York World-Telegram had to print the following headline: "Chiang Troops Gain on Paper, Lose on Ground."

Suhsien, railway center 45 miles south of Suchow, was liberated on November 16, and it is also reported that Gen. Liu Po-cheng's troops are attacking Peng-pu, important railroad center halfway between Suchow and Nanking.

In northwest China, Gen. Hu Tsung-nan's forces, considerably reduced in past battles, are held by the Liberation Army in a pocket round the Chensi provincial capital of Sian. Chiang Kai-shek has little hope of extricating these troops for use against Communist Gen. Lin Piao's Manchurian forces and Gen. Chen Yi's victorious Shantung army.

If Chiang loses Suchow, he will probably move his government to south China. Government official dependents have already been asked to leave Nanking and on November 16, the Nanking diplomatic corps was called to a meeting and decided to ask Chiang what his plans were and whether and when he was going to move out of Nanking.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I wonder if you would tell us, if you know, the sources of information which appear in this article which was prepared by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a gentleman named Israel Epstein?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Is Israel Epstein now in Red China.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Does Israel Epstein supply you with information which you publish in the Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a gentleman named Guenther Stein?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Does Guenther Stein supply you with information that you publish in the Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a woman named Talitha Gerlach?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Does Talitha Gerlach supply you with information which you publish in Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a gentleman named John Powell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a man who appeared before this committee yesterday, William Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you recently seen William Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.



Senator WELKER. Do you see him in the hearing room today?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. You claim your privilege as to whether or not you see William Hinton in the hearing room today, upon the ground that if you do see him, that might tend to incriminate you?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Now, will you look around, madam, and as you look to the rear of the room, the left-hand section of the audience, see whether or not you see a man known to you as William Hinton. Would you mind looking around, please, over in the left-hand section there—no, over to your left.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever have any correspondence with a William Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever spoken on the same platform with William Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Do you know any place that William Hinton has ever spoken in the United States?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, what is the circulation of the Far East Reporter?

Miss RUSSELL. Around about a thousand.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a person named Gerald Tannebaum?

Senator WELKER. Just a moment. You say the Far East Reporter has a circulation of around a thousand?

Miss RUSSELL. It has a circulation of around a thousand.

Senator WELKER. Will you tell me how you know that?

Miss RUSSELL. Because I publish it.

Senator WELKER. You have now admitted that you were the publisher, but when you were handed that exhibit a few moments ago you refused to identify it upon the ground of the fifth amendment.

Miss RUSSELL. I have not refused to identify a single Far East Reporter publication. I refused to identify the other material which you put under my nose.

Senator WELKER. I see. I want to clarify that. I don't want any inference going out—

Miss RUSSELL. I have identified all Far East Reporters.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

I want to see the next to the last exhibit, which I thought was an exhibit from Far East Reporter, the one on germ warfare.

Miss RUSSELL. It was not.

Senator WELKER. That was Far East Spotlight; yes.

Have you ever had any connection with Far East Spotlight?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Well, if you never had any connection with Far East Spotlight, how could that tend to incriminate you?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. I am going to send you down an exhibit, headed "Far East Spotlight, July–September 1949," and down at the bottom thereof it states:

Officers of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy: Maud Russell, executive director—



and it goes on to name some other individuals. I will ask you to look at that exhibit and tell us if your name appears thereon.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You see the name Maud Russell printed thereon?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Have you read the exhibit I sent down to you, madam?

Miss RUSSELL. I have glanced over the first page.

Senator WELKER. All right.

On that first page do you see the name Maud Russell as executive director printed thereon?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. At this point, I want this to go into the record.

(The inside cover of the pamphlet with the list of officers of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, to which Senator Welker referred, was marked "Exhibit No. 146" and is reproduced on the following page, followed by the text of a two-page editorial in the same issue:)

## EXHIBIT 146

**FAR EAST SPOTLIGHT**

A monthly report on U.S. Policy and internal events in China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Southeast Asia and India.



**JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1949**

**Editor**

Elsie Cholmeley

**Editorial Committee**

Bernard Seeman

Elisabeth Solisbee

Ilona Rait Supa

Fred Zerkson

**Recent Contributors**

Charles Bidien

Hugh Bryson

Abraham Chapman

Chu Tong

Hugh Doane

Israel Epstein

Mrs. Feng Yu-hsiang

Shuji Fujii

Gertherd Hagelberg

Amado V. Hernandez

Kuo Mo-jo

Agnes Smadley

Prof. Dirk J. Struik

Luis Tarac

Richard Watts, Jr.

**White Paper Confirms Our Charges**

*Editorial* ..... 3

What Next in Asia? *by Henry A. Wallace* .. 5

The White Paper on China—An Estimate  
*by Frederick V. Field* ..... 7

A Chance to Reorient Asia Policy  
*by Donald G. Treshbury* ..... 12

Blockade of China Hits U.S. Northwest  
*by Kathleen Cronin* ..... 13

Chinese Democrats Repudiate Acheson .... 16

U.S. Opinion Covers Wide Range ..... 19

Lattimore Critique ..... 22

Contrast Features Japan Reactions ..... 23

Comment from Western Europe ..... 24

U.S.S.R. and New Democracies ..... 25

Far East Briefs ..... 30

**Publishers**

Committee for a Democratic  
Far Eastern Policy  
111 West 42nd Street  
New York 18, N. Y.

**OFFICERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY:**

Maud Russell, Executive Director

Philip O. Keeney, Treasurer

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** Hugh Bryson, Abraham Chapman, Rev. John Dury, Jr., Morris Davis, Hugh DeLacy, James Durkin, Frederick V. Field, Talitha Gerlach, Ira Gollobin, Charlotte Honig, C. E. Johnson, Rita Judd, Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Paul Robinson, Nathan Rock, Arthur Schurzer, Chu Tong, Jeannette Turner, Jeffrey Van Cleaf, Susan Warren

The Editor will consider manuscripts submitted, but assumes no responsibility regarding them.

Subscriptions: \$2 a year in the  
U.S. and Canada, \$3 a year  
abroad; single copies 20 cents.



## EXHIBIT No. 146-A

## WHITE PAPER CONFIRMS OUR CHARGES

## AN EDITORIAL

For 4 years the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and Far East Spotlight, have been bringing the facts of United States policy in China to the American public and warning of the inevitable consequences. For this they have drawn upon themselves the rage of assorted reactionaries and the committee was listed as subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark last May. Now, several years and \$6 billion later, the State Department's white paper has been forced to tell the people, in explanation of its present failure, the facts that could have preserved America's friendship with China, millions of Chinese lives, and billions of American taxpayers' dollars, if enough Americans had been allowed to know them in time. We give a few of the hundreds of examples.

We said:

August 1946: " \* \* \* American mediation failed because, while it was going on, the Kuomintang was aided in civil-war preparations, and American lend-lease planes, tanks, and guns were used to slaughter the Chinese people."

February 1947: " \* \* \* The main cause for the failure to restore peace and unity in China lies in the very fact that while you (General Marshall) were attempting to mediate, on the one hand, the basis for mediation was being destroyed by the extensive military and financial aid being given to the Kuomintang reactionaries by the United States, on the other hand."

We said:

January 1948: "Under the fine-sounding name of 'aid' to China, our assistance to the Chiang Kai-shek dictatorship since Japan's defeat has cost over \$4 billion of American taxpayers' money."

April 23, 1949 (statement): "There are also items whose dollar value cannot be estimated. Most important of these are training of Kuomintang troops, maintaining MAGIC (the United States military advisory group in China) which has been training Chiang's troops \* \* \*, (and) United States marines munition dumps turned over to the Nationalist Army."

We said:

April 1947: "The main factor in Kuomintang defeats is the deterioration of morale. \* \* \* Kuomintang's troops, increasingly composed of unwilling recruits, have less and less desire to fight."

We said:

July 1947: "The consequences of the civil bloodshed Chiang started are obvious. Eventually the Chinese people will get rid of his regime and win a truly representative, democratic government, free from the dictatorship of the 'four families'."

We said:

December 1948: " \* \* \* No new intervention can change what \* \* \* United States arms and endless military meddling have already failed to alter."

The State Department now admits:

Page 181: "With respect to United States military-aid programs, General Marshall was being placed in the untenable position of mediating, on the one hand, between the two Chinese groups, while, on the other, the United States Government was continuing to supply arms and ammunition to one of the two groups, namely, the National Government."

They now admit:

Page XV: "Since VJ-day the United States Government has authorized aid to Nationalist China in the form of grants and credits totaling approximately \$2 billion. \* \* \* In addition \* \* \* the United States Government has sold the Chinese Government large quantities of military and civilian war surplus property with a total procurement cost of over \$1 billion."

Page 354: " \* \* \* No dollar value can be put on three of the most vital forms of aid—that rendered by Headquarters, United States Forces, China Theater \* \* \*, by the marines in North China \* \* \*, by the advisory groups."

They now admit:

Page 236: "Even high-ranking military officers have said \* \* \* that whereas there seemed to be some point in endless fighting when the enemy was Japan, there is not much stomach for fighting when it is against Chinese. This lack of morale appears to be reflected among the troops \* \* \*."

They now admit:

Page 573: "Chiang's feudal China cannot long coexist alongside a modern dynamic popular government in North China. The Communists are in China to stay. And China's destiny is not Chiang's, but theirs."

They now admit:

Page XVI: " \* \* \* The ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done \* \* \* could have changed that result \* \* \*."



About many other facts which have been and are being reported in Spotlight, the State Department still prefers to maintain silence. If you think that making them known is more patriotic than keeping them hidden, if you do not want the American people to be kept in ignorance for additional years until some new policy failure prompts another White Paper, you should read every issue of Far East Spotlight, support the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and protest to the Justice Department against the black-listing of the committee for premature truth.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document?

Mr. MANDEL. This is the cover page of Far East Spotlight, dated July-September 1949, volume V, No. 7.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, that volume indicates, does it not, that the Far East Spotlight is a publication of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the executive director and principal officer of that organization is Maud Russell, the witness before us today?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, I am sure you are acquainted with these publications, so I will show you this. This is the Far East Reporter, entitled "Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the People's Republic of China, With Editorial Introduction." Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The pamphlet referred to was marked as "Exhibit No. 147." The introduction appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 147

##### INTRODUCTION

Far East Reporter has reprinted the Constitution of the People's Republic of China adopted on September 20, 1954, by the First National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, as a document of great importance to the American people, particularly at the present time. This is all the more necessary as only a few meager press items on inside pages marked this turning point in the life of nearly one-fourth of humanity. While Secretary of State Dulles and the plenipotentiary of Chiang Kai-shek's papier mache regime solemnly negotiated a mutual defense treaty, the People's Republic of China, the actual Government of China, firmly established its constitutional claim to world recognition.

The Constitution of the People's Republic of China is a genuinely democratic document. It is the more remarkable in that it comes only a brief 5 years after the Chinese people achieved national independence and their first experience, as a nation of domestic political democracy made possible by the end of feudal, landlord domination. Recalling the long years of tutelage advocated by Chiang Kai-shek before the Chinese people could be deemed ready for democracy the new constitution is further evidence that the surest teacher of democracy is the experience itself.

The Constitution of the People's Republic of China is the product of the democratic experience of the Chinese people in the 5 years since liberation. From the first days of the People's Republic, wherever conditions made it possible, all people's representatives conferences were functioning on a local level and elected interim people's governments. It was through such democratic processes and experiences of the great majority of the Chinese people that advances in political consciousness and practice were gained. Participation in land reform, reconstruction of war-devastated industry, flood control, and other major national efforts coupled with the achievement of equality for women freed China's population for constructive participation in the great task of creating a modern industrial nation. These are the material conditions on which the constitution

rests and the guaranty that the rights and privileges pronounced will be forthcoming in life. Its adoption after intensive nationwide discussion insures its popular support.

Codes of laws in former times drew much of their authority from the divine source to which they were attributed or gained respect as the work of some outstanding lawgiver. Such were the Ten Commandments and the codes of Hammurabi and Justinian. In contrast to these, the new Chinese Constitution bears in every part the imprint of its earthy origin.

The United States, the French, the Indian, and many other constitutions, while containing a procedure for amendments, are on their face perpetual. The Chinese Constitution is distinguished from these as it explicitly contemplates its termination in the not too distant future. It is without cavil a constitution for an envisaged period of transition from a capitalist to a socialist society. The preamble states as the perspective "that China can in a peaceful way eliminate exploitation and poverty and build a prosperous and happy socialist society." The classes in Chinese society today—the workers, farmers, petty bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie, and their place in this projected period of change are precisely delimited (arts. 1-20).

Liu Shao-chi, chairman of the constitutional drafting committee, declared in his report to the National People's Congress: The constitution sets "down in legal form, the central tasks of our country in the transition period." The constitution is a framework within "which the people of the entire country unite to build a socialist society \* \* \*. We shall give the capitalists the necessary length of time so that they may accept the transformation step by step, under the leadership of the state and the working class."

The basic structure of the state is clearly defined in article I: "The People's Republic of China is a people's democratic state led by the working class and based on the alliance of workers and peasants." Article II declares that "all power \* \* \* belongs to the people." The government's first concern is plainly those who were the have-nots under Chiang Kai-shek's corrupt landlord regime, workers and farmers, who comprise about 90 percent of the population. Work is now "a matter of honor for every citizen" (art. 16). The leading role accorded the workers is reflected in the electoral law which governs the election of deputies to the National People's Congress. The law apportions 1 deputy to every 800,000 persons in rural areas and 1 for every 100,000 persons in cities.

Of great significance is the guaranty of equality for China's formerly subjugated national minorities—60 different minority groups comprising over 40 million people. Though only 7 percent of the total population, the national minorities have a minimum of 150 deputies, that is to say, about 13 percent of the deputies of the National People's Congress.

The fundamental rights and duties of citizens are set forth in articles 85 to 103. These enumerate civil, economic, and other rights. "All citizens are equal before the law" (art. 85). "All citizens who have reached the age of 18 have the right to elect and be elected" (art. 86). "Citizens \* \* \* have freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, procession and demonstration." The state provides the necessary material facilities to guarantee to citizens the enjoyment of these freedoms (art. 87). Reminiscent of President Roosevelt's proposals for an Economic Bill of Rights (Message on the state of the Union, Jan. 11, 1944) are such rights as "the right to work \* \* \*". The state guarantees this right by planned development of the national economy, by increasing employment step by step, improving working conditions and raising real wages" (art. 91). Coupled with this is "the right to rest" (art. 92); "the right to material assistance in old age, in illness and disability" (art. 93), and "the right to education" (art. 94). The means "to guarantee" each of these rights is spelled out. Especially noteworthy is the declaration that women are "to enjoy equal rights with men in all spheres of political, economic, cultural, social, and domestic life" (art. 96).

Two significant and unique rights guaranteed in China's Constitution are: (1) The right to make charges "against any government worker for transgression of law or negligence of duty" and "the right to compensation" for any resultant loss; and, (2) the right of asylum for foreigners "persecuted for supporting a just cause, for taking part in the peace movement or for scientific activities" (art. 97).

Article 14 prohibits any person "using his private property to undermine public interests." Article 17 requires that "all organs of state must rely on the masses of the people, constantly maintain contact with them, heed their opinions and

accept their supervision." A remedy if deputies fail to heed this mandate is also given, viz., "the right to recall and replace their elected deputies at any time" (art. 39).

Chairman Mao Tse-tung, in connection with attaining the long-range objectives embodied in the constitution, called upon the Chinese people to "be prepared in the course of several 5-year plans<sup>1</sup> \* \* \* to build our country, at present economically and culturally backward, into a great industrialized country with a high standard of living and culture."<sup>2</sup> By these plans the Chinese people, relying mainly on their own toil and resources, seek to make a better life for themselves. This vast project involving 600 million people is clearly a peace plan—it requires peace for its realization, and it requires coexistence among the nations. The constitution states that China's policy is to "develop relations with all countries, based on the principles of equality, mutual benefit, and mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity" and to "strive for the noble cause of world peace" (preamble). Peace is a "must" for China as for all mankind.

Inciters of war with China, powerful and vociferous though a minority, have turned their back on our traditions of 1776. The America that seeks peace and trade with our new Pacific neighbor is in the majority. This America, as it learns the terms of the new constitution, will greet the dignity and progress won by the Chinese people. The constitution is palpable evidence that the People's Republic of China is here to stay. To deny recognition is to gainsay reality and will surely serve our interest ill.

This constitution is a tocsin like our own Declaration of Independence, summing above all, China's workers and farmers, newly freed from feudal and foreign control, to win the abundance which they have been so long denied. Patriotism as well as the highest type of enlightened self-interest is served by Americans standing foursquare for peace, trade, and friendship with the Chinese people and their People's Republic.

Mr. MORRIS. I show you a pamphlet, Far East Reporter, entitled "State Capitalism in China." Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record by reference, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 148" and was placed in the subcommittee file.)

Mr. MORRIS. I show you a Far East Reporter, entitled "China's Foreign Trade Soars—Why Can't Americans Benefit?" Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go in the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The pamphlet referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 149." The text of the pamphlet follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 149

##### CHINA'S FOREIGN TRADE SOARS—WHY CAN'T AMERICANS BENEFIT?

The United States Declaration of Independence contained a long list of accusations against the British King. One of the most important was "for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world."

This was a major grievance leading to the Revolutionary War for independence. Freedom of trade and freedom of the seas have been traditional American slogans, though often misused.

Today trade with new China offers the American toolmaking, machine and automotive workers, American seamen and longshoremen, the American farmer, technician and businessman the possibility of peacetime jobs and profits that do not bring in their wake enormous wartime taxes and war itself. We are cut

<sup>1</sup> China's first 5-year plan begin in 1952.

<sup>2</sup> Address at the opening of the National People's Congress, New York Times, September 16, 1954.



off from this trade not by a foreign government but by our Government in Washington. The virtually complete embargo on trade with new China, has not reduced China's foreign trade which in 1951 registered a sizable increase over that of 1928, the record year under the Chiang Kai-shek regime. In 1951 China's international trade doubled in volume over the year 1950. In that year China also achieved an export surplus for the first time since 1870.

#### PRODUCTION UP

These new developments in China's foreign trade date from 1949 when the Chinese people ended feudalism and colonialism in their country. China has always been known for the abundance of her natural resources. The rapid restoration and development of her economy in the past 3 years has made it possible to utilize those natural resources much more effectively than in the past. Moreover, the successful completion of agrarian reform has generated a tremendous enthusiasm among the peasants resulting in greatly increased production. Total agricultural production in 1951 has already surpassed the highest prewar level. The natural result of this rapid growth in production has been a larger export potential for agricultural produce, animal products, mineral products and industrial manufacturers. China is now producing soybeans, tung oil, vegetable oils, pork, eggs, tea, silk and silk products, bristles, coal, salt, and other commodities in large quantities which are more than enough to meet domestic requirements and can be exported.

#### MORE INCOME—MORE BUYERS

New China's growing capacity to export is wellmatched by her capacity to import. Under Chiang Kai-shek this capacity was limited by the constant deterioration of her economy and the poverty of the masses of the population. This situation has completely changed. One of the distinguishing features of new China and a notable expression of her healthy economy is the rapid growth of the effective purchasing power of her workers and peasants. In the north-east area (Manchuria), as an example, wages and salaries in 1951 registered an increase of 260 percent as compared with March 1948. Peasant income has also increased as a result of greater increase of productivity since land reform. The purchase of new types of farm tools by peasants throughout the country in 1951 increased 151.3 percent as compared with 1950. Growing purchasing power means an expanding market. Under the new conditions created by the economic measures of the People's Republic of China the proverbial saying that "the China market is inexhaustible" is for the first time becoming a reality.

#### ON THE "BASIS OF EQUALITY"

The official policy of the government of the People's Republic of China in regard to foreign trade is very clearly stated in article 57 of the Common Program of the People's Political Consultative Conference: "to develop trading and commercial relations with foreign governments and people on the basis of equality and mutual benefit." This insistence on a "basis of equality and mutual benefit" is a reflection of the determination of new China never to return to the type of foreign-trade relations which existed before 1949 when old China's foreign trade was semicolonial in character. At that time exports, for example, consisted mainly of agricultural products and industrial raw materials while its imports consisted of luxuries and certain types of consumer goods sold in China, not because China needed them, but because the sellers wanted to get rid of them and reap excess profits. As a result, machinery needed for industrial use constituted less than 10 percent of old China's total annual imports. The United States World Economic Report for 1950-51 shows that in 1950, 80 percent of the total imports of new China consisted of machinery and scarce industrial raw material while in the prewar period imports had consisted mainly of consumption goods.

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS

Based on strict adherence to its declared policy of commercial relations with all foreign countries on a basis of equality and mutual benefit, new China has since 1950, annually concluded agreements with the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and the German Democratic Republic.

In the spring of 1952, representatives of the People's Republic of China, convinced that irrespective of differences in social, economic, and political systems,

different countries can live peacefully and develop normal trade relations of benefit to all, attended the International Economic Conference at Moscow along with representatives of 48 other nations. New China takes the position that trade does not involve the question of recognition. During the period of the Conference, the Chinese delegation concluded trade arrangements with 11 nations including Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, West Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Ceylon, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Finland with a total import and export value of \$224 million. Later in the year, in Peking, some Japanese businessmen concluded a trade agreement amounting to some \$180 million with the China Committee for the Promotion of International Trade.

#### UNITED STATES EMBARGO POLICY BOOMERANGS

It should be clear from this brief survey of new China's rapidly expanding foreign trade that the United States policy of blockades, embargoes, and the like, is a negative policy that cannot achieve its object: to obstruct new China's industrial growth and development. What this policy does achieve is to reduce the volume of United States foreign trade causing a drop in employment in all phases of maritime activity including shipbuilding and repair, marine supply and port activity. On December 28, 1952, a spokesman for the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., revealed that 20,000 United States seamen and officers were thrown out of work and 550 United States owned vessels taken out of service during the year. It is a policy which cuts off American workers and businessmen from a steadily rising market for machinery and equipment—a market which does not vanish in times of depression or depend on war for its existence. It is in the bread-and-butter interest of American labor and in the war-or-peace interest of every American to demand an end to this policy. A positive policy of normal trade and friendship with new China is a policy that means millions of peacetime jobs and cooperation for peace instead of provocation for war.

Published by Maud Russell, Room 500, 111 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. MORRIS. I show you another Far East Reporter, entitled "Wanted: A Far East Geneva." Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go in the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The pamphlet referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 150." The text of the pamphlet follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 150

#### WANTED: A FAR EAST GENEVA

(By Susan Warren<sup>1</sup>)

This article, reprinted from the New World Review, points up the importance of a Far East "Geneva" Conference on Korea, Indochina, Taiwan, and other unresolved Asian issues. The present negotiations between the United States and Chinese ambassadors can, despite the diehard opposition of the China lobby, be a big step toward such a conference. The relaxation of the United States embargo on China trade is already hinted at. Expression of public opinion on this and the proposal of Senator George for a meeting between Secretary of State Dulles and Foreign Minister Chou En-lai are very much in order.

The Bandung Conference in which China played a leading part was either ignored or minimized in the American press. Recent events in Algeria, Cyprus, and Indonesia have demonstrated the Asian-African Conference's profound and worldwide impact. Subject peoples can no longer be cheated by guile or cowed by force from moving toward freedom here and now and not in some rosy but distant future.

<sup>1</sup> Susan Warren has long been a student and writer on far eastern affairs. She was formerly editor of the publication Far East Spotlight.

Nor is the vote of the United States delegate to the United Nations against even discussing Algeria, Cyprus, and the return of west Iran to Indonesia likely to strengthen the claim of United States leadership of the free world. The hoary but threadbare alibi that all would be well in the world if only the Kremlin would cease its conspiracies finds fewer and fewer takers.

The United States was in its time a "conspiracy" against the despotic monarchs of Europe. The spirit of 1776 reaches out to those who seek freedom in 1955 with friendship and support.

Most significant in President Eisenhower's report to the Nation on Geneva was the statement, "But I do know the people of the world want peace. Moreover, every other individual who was at Geneva likewise felt this longing of mankind. So there is great pressure to advance constructively \* \* \*" With all regard for the ebullient personalities who took part, Geneva's secret of success was that unseen guest who spoke with the most persuasive voice of all—"the pressure of the people of the world for peace." Pressure, which some have tended to think a little vulgar, like many other things becomes eminently respectable when there is enough of it. Today "pressure for peace" has become highly respectable, because there is so much it has become irresistible.

Yet there are still those who do not want peace. Senator Knowland, for example, has already begun to gnaw away at the new-found atmosphere of conciliation. After a grudging nod to the Geneva talks, the real Knowland soon broke through: "Neither we nor the free world must lull ourselves into a 'Little Red Riding Hood' belief that because the wolf has put on grandmother's cap and nightgown, his teeth are any the less sharp \* \* \*" And for Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and Ngo Dinh Diem, Premier of South Vietnam, increased tension and war are conditions of survival. Rejecting the implications of Geneva, they seek desperately to return to positions of strength.

Testimony to the urgency of a Far East "Geneva" comes from the most varied sources. The Wall Street Journal (August 1) notes long-mounting evidence "that the real explosion point of the world lies not in Western Europe but in the Far East." Senator Walter F. George, Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has called for "face to face" negotiations between Secretary Dulles and Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai. In the British House of Commons, 20 Labor members urged another conference on Geneva lines, including People's China and India, to discuss "urgent Asian" issues. Prime Minister Nehru of India declared (July 19) that the "Far Eastern situation is one of the two major problems of the world \* \* \* it is more explosive than the German problem \* \* \* it cannot be ignored." And Prime Minister Nu of Burma, whose gentle wisdom so impressed Americans on his recent visit, told the press in Tokyo that "A world conference of all countries interested in Asia would be a very good thing," suggesting "tension in the Taiwan area and Indochina" as the top items. Prime Minister Bulganin, reporting to the Supreme Soviet, described Geneva as a "major historical event" signifying a turn in the relations between the U. S. S. R. and the West. He stressed that the Far East is one of the areas of tension which should be examined in the new spirit of Geneva. Finally, Premier Chou En-lai, at the National People's Congress in Peking, hailed the Geneva Conference as one of "positive achievements." He warned, however, that failure to discuss at Geneva the lessening of tension in Asia and the Far East did not mean it had become less urgent: "On the contrary, the situation in the Far East is explosive. \* \* \* Many Asian countries have proposed the holding of a Far Eastern Conference \* \* \* to settle the question of easing tension in the Far East. We support this proposal." The recurring word is "explosive."

The administration's announcement of a United States-Chinese meeting of Ambassadors opened the door to the warm winds of Geneva on the Far East. By the dramatic release on July 31 of 11 United States airmen with the hope that "this measure will have favorable effects on our present talks," the Chinese were, in fact, making a bid to clear the decks for a discussion of crucial issues. Of these, Formosa remains flammable. At Bandung, and subsequently, the People's Republic of China has indicated willingness to discuss with the United States the question of easing tension in that area.

The liberation of Formosa itself they regard as an internal affair. However, they have made clear that "conditions permitting," they are ready "to seek the liberation of Taiwan (Formosa) by peaceful means" and to enter into negotiations with the "responsible local authorities of Taiwan" to this end. Thus it would appear that the Chinese answer to Secretary Dulles' hope that the Chinese



will "renounce the use of force" is to remind him that without United States intervention nothing stands in the way of a peaceful solution of the Formosa problem.

The very act of an American Ambassador meeting with a Chinese Ambassador cannot but help create more favorable conditions for negotiating a Far Eastern settlement. At the present writing the meeting at Geneva has not moved beyond the first point—"the return of civilians of both sides to their respective countries." The atmosphere, however, remains cordial and there is every reason to hope that Chinese Ambassador Wang's expressed conviction that "the forthcoming talks may pave the way for further negotiations between China and the United States" can be realized.

Indochina is another principal tinderbox in the Far East. The Geneva agreement of 1954 temporarily divided Vietnam at the 17th parallel, but set general nationwide elections for July 1956 so the country could be unified. The elections, like the truce, were to be supervised by an International Commission composed of India, Canada, and Poland. Preparatory consultations between competent authorities of North and South Vietnam were set for July 20, 1955.

An "intelligent reader's guide" to understanding the dangerous situation in Vietnam today should include a series of New York Times and other United States press editorials and comment which opened a well-timed barrage weeks in advance of the date for preliminary election consultations. "It is no secret," said a Times editorial of June 29, "that the United States did not like the Geneva agreements \* \* \* the United States was not a signatory nor was the free Government of South Vietnam." On July 7, it urged support of South Vietnam's demand for "more adequate supervision by the U. N. or an enlarged international commission."

Through the early summer and midsummer of 1955, this theme with infinite variations filled the United States press. Senator Mike Mansfield, the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Vietnam expert, offered his opinion: "I don't think there should be elections in Indochina," also on the basis that neither South Vietnam nor the United States were signatories to the agreement. Admitting the "possibility" that breaking the Geneva agreement might reopen civil war in Vietnam, the Senator added that the United States should give "every possible support" by ground troops in that event.

Thus nobody was surprised when South Vietnam's Premier on August 10, rejected outright North Vietnam's offer to discuss general elections to reunite the country, on the basis that South Vietnam had not signed the Geneva agreement, that he must first have assurance that the elections in North Vietnam would be "truly free." In "truly free" South Vietnam, where Reuters (July 3) reported the arrest of "more than 100 men and women for demonstrating in favor of elections to unite Vietnam," the reason for this official lack of enthusiasm is not hard to find. The New York Times (July 8) remarked that in South Vietnam "Peasants make up 80 to 90 percent of the population and it often appears that the Diem Government has few real roots among them."

The plan here is to revive the United States proposal, rejected at the 1954 conference, that the elections should be handled by the United Nations.

Can anyone believe that the "demonstrations" in Saigon in which the demonstrators were brought into the city (Alliance France Presse) "by hundreds of trucks, most of them belonging to the South Vietnam army" to storm and pillage the hotels housing the personnel of the International Commission and the almost simultaneous "spontaneous demonstrations" against the Polish and Czech members of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in South Korea, are anything but a desperate effort to reverse the Korean truce and the 1954 Geneva agreements? It was these two monumental achievements that made Geneva 1955 possible. To wreck them would be to undo Geneva itself. That this is the object was made plain enough by Syngman Rhee. Addressing a "rally" in Seoul, he attacked United States policy as one which now advanced "a new peace of mutual forbearance," and urged the free world "to abandon the drift toward this and other \* \* \* policies." N. Y. Times, August 15.

This article opened on a note which might be called "in praise of pressure." Viewing the New Look abroad in the world, the growing acceptance of the possibility of "living together in peace," renunciation of force, negotiating differences, it can truly be said, "See what the people have wrought." But the victory is not automatically secured forever. It must be defended against those who want to return to the pre-Geneva way. Can there be any doubt that the American people will move on to demand concrete actions along the path which their own efforts and that of the peoples of the world has opened? Today the Far

East urgently requires such actions. A Far East "Geneva" is on the order of the day.

Mr. MORRIS. I show you a pamphlet entitled, "China Trade Facts," published by the Far East Reporter, Maud Russell, publisher. Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go in the record by reference, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The pamphlet referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 151" and was placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I show you a Far East Reporter entitled "Formosa (Taiwan)," by Susan Warren. Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who is Susan Warren?

Miss RUSSELL. A writer.

Mr. MORRIS. Where is she now?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Where was she when she sent this article?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know. I copied it from another magazine. It is a reprint.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record by reference, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman WELKER. I think in fairness to the witness, she should be entitled to tell what magazine she copied it from.

Miss RUSSELL. It is on there.

Senator WELKER. All right. It should go in.

(The pamphlet referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 152" and placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS (reading):

Susan Warren has long been a student and writer on far eastern affairs. She was formerly the editor of the Far East Spotlight.

Senator WELKER. Was that the publication from which you copied this article on Formosa?

Do you have a question, Mr. Rein?

Mr. REIN. I think maybe if she saw the publication she might be able to answer the question a little better.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Miss RUSSELL. It tells on the back from what magazine it was copied or reprinted.

Senator WELKER. Is it correct that the article in this pamphlet is a reprint from the March 1955 issue of the New World Review, and distributed by Far East Reporter, 103 West 93d Street, New York, 25, N. Y.?

Miss RUSSELL. That is what it says; that is true.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that publication formerly Soviet Russia Today?

Miss RUSSELL. I think it was.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have here the Far East Reporter, Descriptive Maps of China.

Is that your publication, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. That is.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record by reference, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 153" and may be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I have here a Far East Reporter, entitled "The Truth About Indochina." Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 154" and may be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I have here a Far East Reporter, entitled "China: Visitors Welcome!" Is that your publication?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go in the record?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 155" and may be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I have here a Far East Reporter, entitled "Bandung, Asian-African Conference." Is that your publication, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. That is.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 156." The text of the introduction to the pamphlet follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 156

##### INTRODUCTION

On April 18, 1955, amid cheering crowds in the beautiful, flag-bedecked mountain resort town of Bandung, Indonesia, 600 delegates of 29 countries entered Merdeka (Freedom) Hall to open the long-heralded Asian-African Conference. At this conference, the first of its kind in history, leaders of 1,450 million people of 2 great continents who make up more than half of the world's total population met to advance the solution of their common problems. The delegates came from diverse cultures and social systems. Here were represented at least 8 different religions and 40 different languages. Here were, linked to the West by defense pacts, nations of SEATO (South-East Asia Treaty Organization) and METO (Middle East Treaty Organization) and Japan; neutralists India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan; and on the road to socialism, China and North Vietnam. What were the forces which brought them together, and what common goals did they seek in Bandung?

The end of World War II saw great upheavals in Asia. Many nations won at least nominal freedom from colonial rule. At first they saw the United States as an ally in their independence movements, but American aid disappointed them, and as Asian economies failed to expand, as foreign trade deficits grew and cost of living rose, as more and more guns were featured and no steel mills, they began to realize that this aid was merely a new form of imperialist domination. On the other hand, the achievement of China in economic advance, and the contribution of China and the Colombo Powers to the Geneva talks were new developments in Asia which gave heart to the Asian peoples. The five principles of peaceful coexistence (mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity; nonaggression; noninterference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence) first set down by Nehru of India and Chou En-lai of China, were governing the relations of a growing number of states. Nehru proclaimed that the acceptance of these principles "enlarged the area of peace" and indicated "a certain historical change in the relationships of forces in Asia \* \* \* and it will not be possible in the future to ignore what the countries of Asia think about themselves or their neighbors. They were ready to establish themselves independently in the world political arena, and they realized that their fate was tied to the fate of Africa, and to world peace.



In December 1954 the Prime Ministers of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia (The Colombo Powers—so named because of the influential Colombo Conference meeting in April 1954 at the time of the Geneva talks, and no relation to the Colombo plan, a British-led development program) met in Bogor, Indonesia, to sponsor an Asian-African Conference, to be held April 18–24, 1955, and issued invitations to 25 nations to participate on a ministerial level. The purposes of the conference, as set forth in the invitation were:

(a) To promote good will and cooperation among the nations of Asia and Africa; to explore and advance their mutual as well as common interests and to establish and further friendliness and neighborly relations.

(b) To consider social, economic, and cultural problems and relations of countries represented.

(c) To consider problems of special interest to Asian and African peoples, for example, problems affecting national sovereignty and of racialism and colonialism.

(d) To view the position of Asia and Africa and their peoples in the world today and the contribution they can make to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

It was repeatedly stressed that it was not the aim of the conference to set up a regional anti-Western bloc, or to provide a battleground for ideologies.

The countries invited included most of the independent or semi-independent nations of Asia and Africa, for the most part young states which have achieved independence in the last 10 years, and which are united in opposition to colonialism and their desire for peaceful development of economic relations. All but one (Central African Federation) accepted. Not invited were Formosa ("we do not recognize it as a state"), Union of South Africa (excluded because of its racial policy), Israel (because of Arab pressure, though the conference was not basically anti-Israel). Most significant was the absence of the imperialist powers which have dominated the colonial world and all previous international or area parleys.

The conference was immediately heralded as a turning point in Asian and world affairs:

Ali Sastroamidjojo, Prime Minister of Indonesia: "We hope that the Asian-African Conference will open a new chapter in the history of man's endeavor to achieve peace in the world." (NYT April 20.)

Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India: "The Asian-African Conference is a final symbol of the emergence of Asia after 200 years of domination by western countries. It seems to be a high privilege of countries outside to carry the burden of Asia on their shoulders. Discussions are made affecting Asia in which Asia has little to say. But it is obvious that things have changed." (Indian Information Service, March 31.) "We are marching in step with history and so success must come to us. It means the self justification of Asia in her own right. It means a healthy climate of peace and cooperation in Asia and in the world." (NYT April 16.)

Tatsunosuke Takasaki, Economic Minister of Japan: "I hope this conference will light the beacon of an Asian and African renaissance and that we will once again raise high the torchlight of our indigenous civilization." (NYT April 20.)

Indonesian Harian Rakjat editorial (December 31): "The conference will write a new page in Asian history."

Peking People's Daily editorial (January 5): "Our voices have been ignored for a long time and our aspirations and demands mocked and suppressed by others. But a change has now taken place. \* \* \* The fate of these vast areas, these countries and peoples, can no longer be controlled by others. Asia has undergone a radical change and dawn is rising over the so-called dark continent of Africa."

The Negro people recognized in the struggle of the colonial peoples against oppression the counterpart of their own struggle for freedom and full equality, and the Negro press reflected this appraisal of the importance of the conference. "Without question the conference is the most important international conclave to be held in the history of mankind." (Pittsburgh Courier, April 16, 1955.) "A new-found solidarity of the colored peoples of the world." (Afro-American, April 30.) "One cannot begin to calculate the broad implications of such a meeting." (Ethel Payne in the Chicago Defender, April 16.) "It cannot be denied. It is a call for freedom and human dignity." (Horace Cayton in Pitts. Cour., April 30.) Representative Adam Clayton Powell described the conference as potentially the "most important event of this century. \* \* \* It will be a

different world from Monday on. It won't be one dominated by western powers but instead it will be one in which eastern powers also must be reckoned with."

The people of Asia showed their support of the conference in tremendous mass demonstrations, 50,000 in Madras, 100,000 in Djakarta, thousands in many other cities, carrying posters with slogans such as "Eliminate colonialism and develop peaceful cooperation." Thousands of young people marched five abreast in a torchlight procession in Bandung during the conference. In fact, all of Indonesia took on an air of festival. The central trade-union organization appealed to all working people to give unreserved support to make the conference a success.

Greetings came to the conference from individuals, organizations, and heads of governments in all parts of the world. There was no greeting from Washington. ("We do not believe that the relationship of this Government to the Bandung Conference would warrant such a message.") It cannot be denied that Washington feared and tried successively to condemn, ignore, and sabotage the conference. John Foster Dulles hurried to Bangkok in February and called a meeting of SEATO nations. He failed either to dragoon any other nations into SEATO or to influence them away from a neutralist position. Not wanting to risk condemnation by openly opposing or boycotting the Asian-African Conference, United States policy turned to sabotage from within. The Philippines and Thailand, who had originally indicated they would not attend, sent delegations bearing "greetings" from Bangkok.

The Asian press and many government spokesmen denounced the Bangkok conference, with its talk of "mobile striking power" and "cooperative security measures for detection and control," as the very opposite of what the Asian-African Conference represented. The totally different nature of the two gatherings was sharply pointed up by the Times of India and the Indonesian *Harian Rakjat*, February 23: "Bangkok and the Asian-African Conference represent two contrasting principles. The former is directed at war, the latter toward peace; the former is based on antagonism, the latter on friendship." Peace, not military alliance, is the way to human welfare.

Criticism in the Asian press and among the delegates generally was equally sharp and widespread for Voice of America speeches on the conference floor which were felt to be "out of tune" with the spirit of the conference; for the effort to isolate China by talk of "buildup" in the Formosa area just before the conference; for the carefully timed Eisenhower announcement of \$2 billions in aid to Asia made while the conference was in session; for the sabotage to a plane bringing death to Chinese delegates and Indian air personnel en route to Indonesia; and for the open lobbying of the United States press, humorously referred to as the "largest delegation to Bandung"—70 strong. There was that correspondent of mysterious status, Representative Adam Clayton Powell, who arrived in an Army plane, urged those delegates who spoke with the Voice of America to make even stronger divisive statements, and called a press conference to give glowing accounts of the high status of the Negro people in the United States. He was generally regarded in Bandung as a "de facto envoy of the State Department." Since his return to the United States, Congressman Powell has made many statements on Bandung—some of them good and constructive and some in the same vein employed at Bandung—divisive and brash. One cannot disagree with his statement that "29 Asian-African nations meeting in Bandung last week placed the United States squarely on the spot. \* \* \* The Asian-African Conference was neither antiwhite nor anti-American, but it most definitely had overtones of being against great chunks of American foreign policy. Because time is running out \* \* \* we must place ourselves solidly on the side of the people fighting colonialism, radicalism, and intolerance in any form. Second, we must realize this: There is now a new group of powers in the world \* \* \* and we must consult with them in every move we make in Asia and Africa from now on." On the other hand, the reaction to Representative Powell's "sweetness and light" account of the racial situation in the United States was best expressed by the Negro publication, *Afro-American* (April 30): "If the State Department had any reservations about Mr. Powell before he took off for the Asian-African Conference, he quickly dispelled them upon his arrival. \* \* \* News accounts say that Mr. Powell confounded his listeners with his blissful account of how lovely and serene were relations between white and colored Americans these days. To tell the truth, Mr. Powell confounded us, too."

Despite all attempts at pressure and intimidation the delegates would not allow themselves to be diverted. They hailed Chou En-lai's conciliatory speeches and his statement on reducing tension, and accepted as the dominant spirit of the

conference the "seeking of common ground while keeping differences." Indonesian Antara News Agency reported, April 26:

"It is generally conceded that the attitude of the Chinese Premier contributed much to the success of the conference. The Chinese delegate time and time again proved to be prepared to meet his counterpart halfway, or even much farther. Chou's statement expressing readiness to enter into negotiations with the United States is in line with the whole conference which aimed at lessening the danger of war."

Amid prolonged cheering and applause the delegates adopted at the final session a communique remarkable for its unanimity and forcefulness in the broad range of subjects it covers. This statement expresses the will of three-fifths of the world's population to take their destiny into their own hands and oppose all forms of oppression; to develop economic and cultural cooperation between the Asian and African peoples; and to "live together in peace."

The influence of the conference is growing daily. Seeds were planted at Bandung that will bear fruit for years to come. Many friendly contacts were made outside of the conference hall that are already leading to settlement of issues, trade agreements, and cultural exchange.

As a record of this historic assembly, and as a contribution to the method of negotiation in seeking widest areas of agreement. Far East Reporter is happy to make available these selected documents of the Asian-African Conference.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, would it be fair to say that you have engaged in lobbying activity on behalf of your beliefs in connection with the Far East.

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you urged Government officials, both in Congress and the executive branch of the Government, to take a particular position on a certain policy?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. You never have?

Miss RUSSELL. The Far East Reporter has not done that.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you, personally?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy ever done that?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You what? You claim your privilege?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege.

Senator WELKER. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy engaged in a campaign to discredit the Chinese National Government and weaken it by demanding an impossible coalition with the Communists?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy urged representatives in Washington to stop all aid to the Chinese Nationalist Government?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, during the time that you were an executive director and principal officer, urged representatives in Washington, including Congressmen and Senators, to secure the complete withdrawal of American Armed Forces from China, Japan, and Korea, and the abandonment of all American bases in these areas?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, while you were executive director and principal officer, asked



Senators and Congressman in Washington to bring about the withdrawal of Gen. Albert Wedemeyer from the Chinese theater of war?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Has the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, during the time that you served as executive director or principal officer, sought to bring about the resignation of Ambassador Patrick Hurley from China?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, do you have anything in the record that would indicate an affirmative to those last two questions?

Mr. MANDEL. I have here the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy information bulletin, volume 1, No. 3, dated November 1945. Under an article entitled "American Intervention in China: Official statements versus facts" we find this paragraph:

There is only one way to avoid this—to pursue a democratic policy. American troops in China should be withdrawn at once. The movement and arming of Kuomintang troops must stop. Generals Hurley and Wedemeyer must be recalled and the activities investigated.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy at the time when you were executive director and principal officer demand the resignation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, during the period you were its executive director, urge Congressmen and Senators in Washington to attack the administration of Indochina by the French Government, Malaya by the British, and Indonesia by the Dutch?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record some papers which Mr. Mandel will describe, and by way of describing them, will read some of them. May they go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits No. 157, 157-A, and 157-B." The texts follow:)



## EXHIBIT No. 157-A

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY, 58 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK,  
N. Y.

Telephone: Lexington 2-2164, Lexington 2-1189 (Information Committee)  
Executive director: Maud Russell

## WHAT ARE WE SAYING AND WHAT ARE WE DOING?

## CLAIM

"The United States has assumed a definite obligation in the disarmament and evacuation of Japanese troops \* \* \* United States Marines are in north China for that purpose. United States support (for China) will not extend to any United States military intervention to influence the course of any civil conflict \* \* \*."—President Truman, statement on China Policy, December 15, 1946.

## FACT (6 MONTHS LATER)

"The conference was held \* \* \* between American Intelligence officers and Japs. Then a stubby Japanese colonel named Sasai \* \* \* began to speak of movements and attacks made by Communist troops \* \* \* Sasai spoke just as if he were taking part in a field conference during a campaign and the Americans were his fellow officers \* \* \*. On the way back from this conference one of the American intelligence officers remarked: 'Those Japs are going to be our allies in the next war \* \* \*. They talk our language.'"—John Hersey, in a report to the New Yorker, May 5, 1946.

## CLAIM

"The United States Government considers that the detailed steps necessary to the achievement of political unity in China must be worked out by the Chinese themselves and that intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate. The United States Government feels, however, that China has a clear responsibility to the other United Nations to eliminate armed conflict within its territory as constituting a threat to world stability and peace—a responsibility which is shared by the National Government and all Chinese political and military groups."—President Truman, statement on China Policy, December 15, 1946.

## FACT

"Chinese minority parties fought today to prolong the Manchurian truce, but Gen. Tu Yu-ming; Government army commander in Manchuria, said he expected to resume his advance when the armistice with the Communists ended at noon June 22."—AP dispatch from Nanking, New York Times, June 9, 1946.

"The United States Fourth Marine Regiment was reported to have prepared defense positions on the outskirts of Tsingtao \* \* \*. The heavy cruiser *Los Angeles* and five destroyers are in the harbor. Twelve United States Corsair fighters roared in from Peiping \* \* \*."—New York Times, AP dispatch, June 14, 1946.

"As powerful United States—armed forces from Nationalist China pause mid-way in their drive along the Mukden-Harbin Railway \* \* \* widespread fighting still continues."—New York Times, report by Benjamin Wells, June 15, 1946.

"American personnel of the Seventh Fleet at Tsingtao are training Chinese to operate landing craft \* \* \*."—New York Times, report by Henry R. Lieberman, June 16, 1946.

## WHAT YOU CAN DO

Write to President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, your Senators and Congressmen.

Demand the immediate recall of all United States troops from China. No American boys must die fighting beside Japanese against Chinese in a civil war.

Protest against any loan to China till "peace and unity" are established. Not a cent should be given to finance the shedding of Chinese blood.

Read this committee's monthly bulletin and send your questions about what is going on in the Far East to us.

Contribute to help further the work of this committee.

We call you to action.



(The following appears on the reverse side of the above document:)

### DO WE KEEP TROOPS IN CHINA FOR THIS?

The China Weekly Review—J. B. Powell, editor and publisher. (In the United States, address: 35 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.) John W. Powell; Edward Rohrpough; Walter H. Wiener, financial editor; F. K. Chao, business manager. Published at 160 Chung Cheng Road (Eastern), Shanghai, China, April 20, 1946.

### NORTH CHINA HUNTING

Last week an American sailor was shot in north China. A little earlier a United States Marine met a similar death at the hands of unidentified persons. There have been others who died in countryside ambushes during the months since the Jap surrender, and the trend of events shows nothing to indicate that there will not be new killings of American servicemen in the future. In the early days after the surrender, such shootings were attributed to "Communists," but more recently the newspapers have refrained from guessing at the political affiliations of the killers.

The United States is not at war with any faction in China, and though the Communists have often accused American forces of aiding the Kuomintang directly and indirectly in the civil war, both Red China and Kuomintang China have expressed appreciation for the American part in the war against Japan and both have welcomed cultural and commercial intercourse with America in the future. Both have welcomed the mediation of China's internal difficulties by General Marshall.

Then why these killings? A little investigation reveals that most of them occurred under similar conditions. Usually, 1 or 2 Americans went hunting in an area somewhere close to the battle or blockade lines of the two factions in China's spasmodic civil war. They were, of course, in uniform and they were quite naturally armed. Such circumstances are enough to render the status of "hunters" doubtful in the minds of combatants, but they hardly constitute a full explanation.

A couple of weeks ago, riding in a jeep with an enlisted man of the Marines, we engaged in a conversation which may further clarify the killings. The enlisted man had never seen action, he told us, and he seemed to feel he had been cheated. Inspired by stories of Guadalcanal and Tarawa, he had enlisted in the branch of the United States Armed Forces which he thought would offer the most opportunities for military glory. He had intended to enroll in Harvard University, but Harvard would always be there. He could enroll in Harvard when he returned to America. The young never doubt that they will return.

But the war ended while he was still in the United States and he came to China as a replacement for the men who had fought the war in the Pacific. There was no prospect of action. There were only bars that charged exorbitant prices and coolies who looked to him like a definitely inferior people and girls who fawned and pouted and performed for cash. The young Marine thought it was all pretty sordid and not glorious at all—nothing to compare with his mental picture of blasting a chunky, tough Jap from behind a coral reef.

He brightened as he talked. Recently things had been picking up.

"Now we sometimes get to go out on shooting parties," he said. "That makes it a little better."

He explained about the shooting parties. "An officer goes along and you carry automatic weapons, usually a carbine and a .45. Of course, a lot of the time you don't see anything, but sometimes you do. I haven't managed to go yet, but I've been promised a chance for next week."

Having never heard of the existence of much game in the area, we asked, "What do you shoot?"

"Why, Communists," said the young marine, looking a little surprised.

It took us a moment or two to absorb the implications of what he had said and then we asked, "How do you know they're Communists?"

"I don't know," he answered. "I guess it's because the Communists are in that territory. At least, that's what the Chinese say."

Then, feeling a little justification necessary, he added, "The guys say they got at us, too."

The jeep stopped and we got out and thanked the young marine for the lift.

## HOMECOMING AGAIN DELAYED

[New York Herald Tribune, June 5, 1946]

SHANGHAI, June 4 (UP).—United States Army forces will not deactivate the China theater by the end of June, as originally planned, and may remain for the rest of 1946, Lt. Gen. Alvin C. Gillem, Jr., commander of American forces in the absence of Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, disclosed today. Gillem said Army strength will be reduced to 4,000 during the last half of 1946.

Late in April, Wedemeyer said he believed the American mission in China—to disarm and repatriate Japanese and move government troops to north China—would be completed in June, and that the theater would be deactivated by the end of the month.

In addition to the 4,000 troops mentioned above there are some 50,000 marines and many naval units stationed in China. No withdrawal date is set for these.

## EXHIBIT No. 157-B

## HOUSE BILL H. R. 6795 FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO CHINA

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy appeals to you to do everything in your power to prevent or delay the passage of bill H. R. 6795 which provides for military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes. This bill has already been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

## REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

*1. The bill violates the stated policy of the United States as enunciated by President Truman on December 15, 1945*

President Truman said: "It is the firm belief of this Government that a strong, united, and democratic China is of the utmost importance to the success of the United Nations Organization and for world peace. \* \* \*

"\* \* \* the management of internal affairs is the responsibility of the peoples of the sovereign nations.

"\* \* \* United States support will not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife. \* \* \*

"The United States is cognizant that the present National Government of China is a 'one party government.' \* \* \*

"The United States Government considers that the detailed steps necessary to the achievement of political unity in China must be worked out by the Chinese themselves and that intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate.

"China has a clear responsibility to the other United Nations to eliminate armed conflict within its territory as constituting a threat to world stability and peace. \* \* \*

"As China moves toward peace and unity \* \* \* the United States would be prepared to assist the National Government in every reasonable way to rehabilitate the country, improve the agrarian and industrial economy, and establish a military organization capable of discharging China's national and international responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and order."

Instead of moving toward peace and unity, China today is on the brink of a savage, countrywide civil war.

*2. The majority of the Chinese people are unequivocally opposed to the bill*

(a) *General opposition.*—An AP dispatch in the New York Times, June 26, reported: "Demands for the withdrawal of United States forces from China caused grave concern today at the headquarters of Gen. George C. Marshall. \* \* \* A spokesman for 54 anticivil war groups in Shanghai demanded today that American forces go home and that United States aid to China be halted immediately. \* \* \* Their spokesman, Dr. Tao Hsing-chih, told a press conference that 'I am inclined to think Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek wants civil war,' and that reactionary supporters of the Generalissimo desired it as their one chance of retaining power."

This expresses the general feeling in China that the ruling Kuomintang Party wants American aid for purposes of civil war.

(b) *Communist opposition.*—Although it is stated that the United States military training program will include training of Chinese Communist divisions, Gen. Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist armies "raised objections on the ground that the plan would make China too much dependent on American industry. \* \* \* He said the first step should be to develop industry and improve agricultural conditions, letting the state of Chinese economy determine the size and character of the national army." (New York Times, June 25, 1946.)

"The Communist Party chairman, Gen. Mao Tze-tung, \* \* \* demanded that the United States cease all military aid to the Chinese Government and promptly evacuate American forces from China. \* \* \* He asserted that the withdrawal of American forces was long overdue, charging that their presence had become a grave menace to the national security and freedom of the Chinese people. 'Under such circumstances,' he added 'the Chinese Communist Party cannot but firmly oppose the further selling and exchange of lend-lease goods and the presenting of arms by the United States Government to the Kuomintang dictatorial government and the sending of a United States military advisory group to China.'" (New York Times, June 25, 1946.)

These objections cannot be ignored because:

(i) They are raised by 1 of the 2 parties between which General Marshall is seeking agreement;

(ii) The Communist Party controls 1,200,000 regular troops, or more than one-third of the total in all Chinese armies;

(iii) The Communists are the leading element in the administration of sections of Chinese territory (including Manchuria) which contain 200 million people, or more than 40 percent of the country's population.

(c) *Democratic League objections.*—The Democratic League is a coalition of all parties in China except the Communists and Kuomintang. It is especially strong in educational and professional circles, and stands for conciliation as opposed to civil war. Its spokesman, Dr. Lo Lung-chi, "a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and close to General Marshall during Government-Communist truce negotiations in Chungking, also asserted the United States was 'taking sides' and asked that all American troops be evacuated from China." (New York Times, May 31, 1946.)

#### 4. *The bill is an infringement of the sovereignty of China*

If Chinese armies are armed by America, in the absence of developed Chinese industry, it will perpetuate China's dependence on American industry, since the arms supplied will be useless without United States munitions. Under the bill the President is made, in effect, Commander in Chief of the Chinese armies, for he "is authorized upon application from the Republic of China, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and the United States Navy and Marine Corps to assist the Republic of China" and "may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this Act \* \* \*"

#### 5. *The bill would give the President unprecedented peacetime powers over the country's Far Eastern policy for the next 10 years (the term of the bill)*

The power of the President would be unlimited as the bill specifies that it may be exercised "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law."

#### 6. *The bill assumes for the United States the prerogatives of the United Nations*

The bill states that military assistance is to be given to China in order that China may fulfill "obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations." These obligations are not yet known, and by giving such assistance now the United States is presupposing the lines along which decisions of the United Nations will be made.

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy considers that the hasty passage of such a bill during the precess rush would be a calamity for China and possibly for world peace. Consideration should at least be deferred until Congress reconvenes by which time the situation in China may be clearer.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY,  
58 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

JUNE 28, 1946.



Mr. MORRIS. These papers indicate that there was considerable effort on the part of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy to use pressure and to lobby on behalf of the individual purposes of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy about which we have asked the witness today.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. MANDEL. I have in my hand a petition to the President, the Secretary of State and Congress, which reads as follows:

"We demand, get out of China. The United States has made available to Chiang Kai-shek over \$5 billion worth of American credit and articles and military services since V-J Day. This has been used to conduct civil war against the Chinese people. If this policy continues, the sending of American combat troops to China will eventually follow.

We urge: (1) no loans, no arms, no troops to China; (2) withdraw all United States military personnel training and advising Chiang's forces; (3) allow the Chinese people to settle their own affairs and act to restore once more the traditional friendship between them and ourselves.

This is marked "Return to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 111 West 42d Street," and it has a form for contributions.

Next we have a printed circular of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy; address, 58 Park Avenue, New York 16; executive director, Maud Russell, which has the following demands:

What you can do: Write to President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, your Senators and Congressmen, demand the immediate recall of all United States troops in China. No American boys must die fighting beside Japanese against Chinese in the civil war. Protest against any loan to China until peace and unity are established. Not a cent should be given to finance the shedding of Chinese blood. Read this committee's monthly bulletin and send your questions about what is going on in the Far East to us. Contribute to further the work of this committee.

Then we have attached thereto House bill H. R. 6795 for military assistance to China. And it gives reasons for opposition. This is sent out by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Next we have another circular, a circular letter from the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy dated June 24, 1947, signed Maud Russell, executive director. It says:

Fellow citizens—

and at the end:

We urge you to let the President, the State Department and your Congressmen know that you are opposed to further American support designed to bolster Chiang Kai-shek's crumbling, unpopular regime. Go into action, and get individuals, groups, and organizations in your community to protest the granting of such aid under any guise to the Kuomintang government. The United States must cease being the arsenal of oppression in China. Let us know of your protest to Washington.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL.

(The letter was marked "Exhibit No. 158." The text follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 158

JUNE 24, 1947.

From: The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 111 West 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.

FELLOW CITIZENS: The enclosed memo is self-explanatory.

Since this memo was compiled news reports have appeared in the New York press showing the desperate dependence of the Nanking regime on the United States to save Chiang Kai-shek from defeat by his own people. Sun Fo, United

Press reports on June 21, said, "Help and encouragement is needed at once \* \* \* this help should include not only military supplies and credits but also vigorous political support." Tillman Durdin, in the New York Times of June 21, writes "Dr. Sun urged application of the Truman doctrine to China more effective aid to the Chinese Government. \* \* \* He stressed that the Government needed United States arms and ammunition. Ammunition for the American weapons in the Government Army are being exhausted. \* \* \* Dr. Sun indicated that the aid to China might run into billions of dollars over a period of years."

The following paragraph from a letter received from China this week tells its own story about popular Chinese reaction to American aid to Chiang Kai-shek:

"One thing is certain, the Chinese people will not be pleased. Another loan from the United States will make them realize how completely dependent on United States support is this regime which rules them with the whip and the bullet. They will know that their sons and daughters languish in concentration camps and in the misery of the torture chamber because it pleases Washington to keep this regime in power a little longer. The clearer this becomes the more deep, bitter, and widespread will become the hatred of America."

We urge you to:

Let the President, the State Department, and your Congressman know that you are opposed to further American support designed to bolster Chiang Kai-shek's crumbling unpopular regime.

Go into action and get individuals, groups, and organizations in your community to protest the granting of such aid, under any guise, to the Kuomintang government.

The United States must cease being the arsenal of oppression in China.  
Let us know of your protests to Washington.

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL, *Executive Director.*

P. S.—A contribution from you right now will enable us to inform and mobilize more Americans who want to join in this fight. Each \$5 enables us to reach an additional hundred people.

Then we have a printed circular from the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 58 Park Avenue, which lists as urgent:

Wide support needed for Representative Delacy's resolution for immediate withdrawal of United States troops and equipment—

and also—

Public must know the facts: Why are United States troops and equipment involved in China's civil war? How can we change this policy?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that Mr. Mandel has described sufficiently the papers that we plan to introduce in the record at this time. And I suggest that we offer them to the witness, to see if she will indicate if there is something inaccurate about those.

Senator WELKER. Very well. It will be so ordered.

First, Madam Witness, I notice you are taking notes. Would you mind telling me what you are taking notes about? You are on the witness stand now, and if there is something here that is not fair to you I want to know about it, and if I can help you or your counsel, I want to be of assistance to you.

Miss RUSSELL. No. I will handle it myself. It is just as an aid to memory.

Senator WELKER. I didn't hear that.

Miss RUSSELL. I can handle it myself without help from you. It is just an aid to my memory.

Senator WELKER. Very well. You go right ahead.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment in connection with this material.

(The circular was marked "Exhibit No. 159." The text of each side is printed below:)

## EXHIBIT No. 159

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY, 58 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK  
16, N. Y.

## Directors:

Maxwell Stewart, writer  
Leland Stowe, foreign correspondent  
C. Sidney Gardner, Far Eastern specialist  
E. Franklin Frazier, sociologist  
Rev. S. H. Fritchman, magazine editor  
Frederick V. Field, Far Eastern specialist  
Talitha Gerlach, Women's Leader  
Freda Kirchwey, editor, The Nation  
Arthur Upham Pope, Far Eastern specialist  
Martin Popper, Lawyers' Guild  
Mrs. H. A. Rusch, Jr., Women Leader  
Mrs. Edgar Snow, author  
Rose Terlin, Women's Leader  
J. Raymond Walsh, radio commentator.  
Richard Watts, Jr., foreign correspondent  
Tom Wright, labor editor

## Consultants:

Israel Epstein, foreign correspondent  
Laurence E. Salisbury, Far Eastern specialist  
Gunther Stein, foreign correspondent  
Ilona Ralf Sues, author

Every \$500 the committee receives means a group of America's foremost experts on the Far East can reach Senators and Congressmen with documented facts and background material which can help influence American policy in China and prevent a third world war.

*Urgent—Wide support needed for Representative DeLacy's resolution for immediate withdrawal of United States troops and equipment*

Every \$100 keeps our press releases flowing to more than 100 national radio commentators and newspaper columnists who are supplied with vital data on China and the Far East to pass on to their millions of listeners and readers. Our Information Bulletin, with your donation, can be sent to additional thousands of influential citizens.

*Urgent—Public must know the facts: Why are United States troops and equipment involved in China's civil war? How can we change this policy?*

Every \$50 helps build citizens' committees throughout the country, means more speakers at community forums. Not the least, it provides us with funds to meet the committee's operating expenses. Every contribution, no matter how small, is put to useful work to prevent world war III.

As a contributor to the committee, you will be kept fully informed of its work and will regularly receive its literature.

URGENT!

Memo from Leland Stowe, Richard Watts, Jr.

More American troops, planes and supplies are in China today than there were at any time during the war with Japan. Civil war is raging throughout China, endangering the lives of American fighting men.

There would be no civil war now if American troops and equipment were brought home and future support to Chiang Kai-shek was made conditional upon internal peace and unity in China.

Although General Hurley has resigned, the appointment of General Marshall as special envoy to China does not necessarily mean a change in the present American policy of intervention in China's internal affairs.

An enlightened public and an informed Congress must stop intervention in China. China must not become the battleground of a third world war.

We feel that you can help most effectively by contributing generously to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy which is today leading the fight for a better American policy in China through a program of education and action. This work is vital and must be continued. It can only be done with your financial assistance.



We are writing you because we are confident that you will recognize the urgency of the situation and that you will mail your contribution today.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND STOWE.  
RICHARD WATTS, Jr.

P. S.—Return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Senator WELKER. Now, Miss Russell, I have been handed documents which have been identified by you as having been published by your Far East Reporter, a number of them here, that you see. And I hold in my hand one which is printed with red and white in it, and it says: "Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the People's Republic of China, with editorial introduction"; price 20 cents.

Now, you printed that, or your concern printed that, did you not?

Miss RUSSELL. I printed it.

Senator WELKER. And what did you do with that? Did you distribute it or sell it?

Miss RUSSELL. I sent it to my subscribers. I sold it throughout the country, sold it to bookstores.

Senator WELKER. Can you give me any idea of about how many you printed or sold?

Miss RUSSELL. Oh, about four or five thousand.

Senator WELKER. Have you printed the Constitution of the United States and distributed it to the people throughout the country?

Miss RUSSELL. That is available. They studied it in school. What I was trying to do is tell people what is going on in the Far East, and that is pertinent.

Senator WELKER. I ask you if you distributed the Constitution of the United States.

Miss RUSSELL. No; it is not in the Far Eastern policy.

Senator WELKER. You specialized on the Constitution of the People's Republic of China?

Miss RUSSELL. I specialized on material in the Far East.

Senator WELKER. And you didn't spend any time whatsoever in helping the American people study their own Constitution?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes, I have.

I think the fact that I speak out on an issue that people like you don't agree with, is a help to people understanding their citizens' rights under the Constitution.

Senator WELKER. You haven't used your press to send out the Constitution of the United States with editorial introduction, have you?

Miss RUSSELL. I have presented material on the Far East, which is not available otherwise.

Senator WELKER. When is the last time you have read the Constitution of the United States?

Miss RUSSELL. Oh, I read at it every now and then. I don't think I have read it through. I say, I read here and there, particularly of my rights under the Constitution.

Senator WELKER. You read the fifth amendment?

Miss RUSSELL. Not only the fifth; there are other pertinent parts.

Senator WELKER. I suppose you read the first, and Mr. Hinton brought in the fourth, and the tenth, and a few others like that.

Miss RUSSELL. Are you insinuating that these are not public documents?

Senator WELKER. Not in the least.

Miss RUSSELL. I do read them. I stand on my rights on them.

Senator WELKER. I believe I know about as much about that Bill of Rights as you do.

Miss RUSSELL. I hope so.

Senator WELKER. I am just wondering what other provisions of the Constitution of the United States have you read and studied in the last few years since you have been in this world.

Miss RUSSELL. That is not pertinent to this.

Senator WELKER. It isn't?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Senator WELKER. Not very pertinent?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

I am an American citizen who knows her rights under the Constitution.

Senator WELKER. You are an American citizen who knows her rights; there is no question about that; you have evidenced that here today. You have taken advantage of them many, many times.

These are to be introduced in the record.

Now, do you know what the Worker is?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Do you know what the New York Times is?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Do you know what the U. S. News & World Report is?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Now, after all, Miss Russell, let's get along. You have gone ahead and testified about getting information from these publications, so let's not hedge about the matter, and let's not have any ill will between the acting chairman and the witness.

Now, I think you have opened up that subject matter, and I am not trying to trick you at all. You testified one time that you have gotten information from these newspapers and magazines, and now I ask you if you know what they are, and you take the fifth amendment. I don't believe you are being fair with the committee or with yourself.

Miss RUSSELL. Yes, I know these publications.

Senator WELKER. Well, then, tell me, what is the Worker?

Miss RUSSELL. It is a leftwing publication.

Senator WELKER. It is a leftwing publication. Can I help you, and see whether or not this is correct: It is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker; is that correct?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes, that is correct.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever been quoted in the Worker?

Miss RUSSELL. Not to my recollection.

Senator WELKER. Now directing your attention to the date of May 8, 1949, you were quoted in the Worker, Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, as saying this:

Yet the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy is not solely a supplier of information; we are a political action group to exert pressure for a change in official United States policy.

Did you or did you not make that utterance, so that it was quoted in the Worker?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. And if you did so make that utterance as quoted by me, then the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy certainly was engaging in lobbying; isn't that a fair assumption?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Now, directing your attention to the Worker, the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker for the same date, May 8, 1949, section 2, pages 3 and 4, an article headed "Truth Also Fights for a Free China," Maud Russell is quoted as follows in this article:

"Yet the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy is not solely a supplier of information," its executive director is quick to point out. "We are a political action group to exert pressure for a change in official United States policy," Maud Russell declares. Return to China? Maud Russell's answer is a vigorous "No." "My place is here in my own country," the executive director for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy declares.

Did you so make those utterances, and were you quoted correctly in the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, commonly and officially known as the Worker?

Miss RUSSELL. I stand on my rights under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, have you reported in your publications, in the Far East Reporter, on the Asian-Pacific Peace Conference? By way of refreshing your recollection, Miss Russell, I offer you a Far East Reporter entitled "Asia and World Peace, Whither Japan? Answers by a Japanese—Toga Kameda, and an Australian—Victor James."

Miss RUSSELL. Yes; I did; Far East Reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the source of your information for that particular publication?

Miss RUSSELL. These were reprints of documents for reference.

Mr. MORRIS. Where did you receive those?

Miss RUSSELL. These were widely distributed in the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Where did you receive your particular copy?

Miss RUSSELL. I got quite a number of copies. I don't remember what particular copy this came from. There are many, many copies of this. They came from various sources.

Mr. MORRIS. Did John Powell bring you any of these?

Miss RUSSELL. This was printed——

Senator WELKER. The question was, Did John Powell bring any of them?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights——

Senator WELKER. Do you know John Powell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Senator WELKER. Do you know a publication in Red China called China Monthly Review?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did Julian Schuman bring you any of this material concerning the Asian-Pacific Peace Conference?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I have here what appears to be an invitation, Miss Russell: "The Far East Reporter takes pleasure in providing an opportunity for its subscribers and friends to meet Anita and Henry Willcox, American delegates, Asian and Pacific Peace Conference, Peking, China, October 1952. Mrs. Willcox will tell us about 'A Day in a Peking Prison,' followed by a discussion of justice in new China.



Mr. Willcox will talk about 'Housing and Construction in New China,' as seen by an American engineer. Time: Sunday evening, January 25, 8 p. m."

Now, did you extend that invitation, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Anita and Henry Willcox?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that paper?

And then, Mr. Chairman, may it go into the record as properly identified?

Senator WELKER. Yes, after identification.

Mr. MANDEL. This is apparently an invitation mimeographed, headed "Far East Reporter takes pleasure in providing an opportunity for its subscribers and friends to meet Anita and Henry Willcox." It has Chinese on the left-hand side, and at the bottom is "r. s. v. p. Miss Russell 111 West 42d Street."

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 160." The portion in English is printed below:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 160

Far East Reporter takes pleasure in providing an opportunity for its subscribers and friends to meet Anita and Henry Willcox, American delegates Asian and Pacific Peace Conference, Peking, China, October 1952.

Mrs. Willcox will tell us about "A Day in a Peking Prison," followed by a discussion of justice in the new China. Mr. Willcox will talk about "Housing and Construction in New China," as seen by an American engineer.

Time: Sunday evening January 25, 8 p. m. Place: 444 Central Park West (at 104th), apartment 12G (take the rear elevator).

We hope you will want to join us.

R. s. v. p. Miss Russell 111 West 42d Street.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you show that to the witness, Mr. Arens?

Miss Russell, did you extend that invitation?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. I have here a little note:

*To our subscribers and friends:* You are cordially invited to an evening with Rev. John Darr, for over 2 years American secretary in the secretariat of the World Peace Council, who attended the preparatory conference of the peace conference of the Asian and Pacific regions. Mr. Darr will speak on New China and World Peace.

You are invited to meet Mr. Darr on Sunday evening, May 17, at 8 o'clock, at the home of Miss Annette Rubinstein, 59 West 71st Street, apartment 10A.

We do hope you can join us for this informal but rich evening.

(Signed) MAUD RUSSELL,  
Publisher, Far East Reporter.

I show you that invitation and ask you if you did extend that invitation.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record at this time, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 161," and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 161

*To Our Subscribers and Friends:*

You are cordially invited to an evening with Rev. John Darr, for over 2 years American secretary in the secretariat of the World Peace Council, who attended the preparatory conference of the peace conference of the Asian and Pacific regions. Mr. Darr will speak on New China and World Peace.

You are invited to meet Mr. Darr on Sunday evening, May 17, at 8 o'clock, at the home of Miss Annette Rubinstein, 59 West 71st Street, apartment 10A. We do hope you can join us for this informal but rich evening.

(Stamp signature) MAUD RUSSELL,  
*Publisher, Far East Reporter.*

RSVP Miss Russell, 103 West 93d Street, New York City.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have three more pamphlets of the Far East Reporter.

They are: The first one I mention, "Whither Japan?" The second, "How the USA Curbs National Independence"; and the third, "Asia Tells the World what the United States Is Doing in Asia; Why Asia Demands Peace," all published by the Far East Reporter.

Is that an accurate statement, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. MORRIS. May they go in the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The pamphlets referred to were marked "Exhibits No. 162, No. 163 and No. 164" and are available in the subcommittee's files. The text of the introduction to the pamphlet "Whither Japan," Exhibit No. 162, is printed below:)

#### ON THE JAPANESE QUESTION

Togo Kameda, member of the Japanese delegation

The present position of Japan is the result of the close collaboration during the last few years between the United States occupation authority and the Yoshida government. A year ago a separate peace treaty and the United States-Japanese Security Pact were signed at San Francisco. These two treaties provide for the permanent occupation of Japan by the United States forces, the construction of military bases in Japan without restriction, the rearmament of Japan by the United States. These provisions make Japan into an ally of the United States aggressor, and render difficult a speedy termination of the state of war between Japan and certain countries. These two treaties are in fact treaties of a war alliance which will make Japan the enemy of every Asian people.

Moreover, this alliance is an alliance between the United States warmongers who are wantonly slaughtering the Korean people, and the Japanese militarists whose hands are stained with the blood of other Asian peoples and who, armed with United States-made weapons, now attempt to repeat their aggression against the Asian peoples. It is clear that this alliance has a common basis. On the one hand, the United States warmongers, with a view to carrying out their aggression in Asia, plan to get the Japanese militarists to help them and convert Japan into a tool for a new war of aggression. On the other hand, the Japanese militarists, seeking to revive the dead, and to realize their old dream of a "greater eastern Asia coprosperity sphere," are hoping to make use of United States aid to reassert their old influence in Asia. The basis of this alliance lies in the use of Japanese industry, which is the most developed in Asia, and of the strategic position of Japan and its vast source of manpower, for the preparing and waging of a new war of aggression. Here lies the new menace to Asia, namely, the revival of Japanese militarism. Thus, long before the conclusion of the separate peace treaty, the Japanese militarists who had in actual fact been controlling the state apparatus, cast off their masks and came out into the open. The only difference distinguishing their present from their past is that now they don American caps and clothes and arm themselves with United States-made weapons. The rearmament of Japan is now being carried out in the open; a militarised police state has again emerged, and Japanese enterprises are being turned into war industries.

At present, the aims of the rearmament of Japan envisaged by the foreign occupying power and the Japanese militarists are as follows: to build up an army of 300,000 men and to build as a start, a small-size navy and air force during next year. To this end a system of conscription is to be enforced. At the same time, a security board has been set up with Yoshida himself as the head, and it is intended to turn the board into a ministry of defense in the future.

The core of this force is the police reserve corps, 75,000 strong, established after the outbreak of the Korean war. This police reserve corps is scheduled to expand to a strength of from 110,000 to 200,000 men by the end of the year. It has been equipped with airplanes, tanks and other heavy arms and has begun war maneuvers. Another aspect is this: the Japanese police force has expanded from its prewar 50,000 men to over 120,000, the Government has initiated a great number of acts of repression, such as the Subversive Activities Prevention Act, depriving the people of their freedom, and the Government apparatus has been turned into a fascist armed-police state. To meet the needs of the United States Armed Forces and cope with the rearmament of Japan, the main branches of Japanese industry have been rapidly converted into war industries. Their production already includes the manufacture of airplanes, naval vessels and similar complete units. The reestablished Japanese armed forces are not for the self-defense of the Japanese people, but for external aggression and for the internal repression of the Japanese people. They constitute a threat that bodes disaster to the Japanese people and to the peoples of the other areas of the Asian and Pacific regions as well.

Similarly, the foreign policy of the Japanese Government has made it plain that its orientation is toward becoming the major accomplice of the United States in the latter's drive for a new war of aggression in the East. For instance, the Yoshida government, in accordance with the requirements of the Battle Act, which is politically and economically aimed at blockading the Soviet Union and China, has declared an embargo on trade between Japan and the Soviet Union and China. Actually, however, the principal party who suffered from the disastrous consequences of this blockade is neither the Soviet Union nor China, but Japanese economy and the livelihood of the Japanese people themselves. Recently the Yoshida government has gone further, accepting the mutual security program, and putting into force the so-called plan for the development of southeast Asia, in an attempt to plunder the strategic raw materials of these countries, and to help United States imperialism construct military bases there. In open antagonism to China, the Yoshida government has also concluded with the Chiang Kai-shek fugitive regime in Taiwan a so-called peace treaty, and schemed to expel the Soviet delegation from Japan. Recently, at the Honolulu meeting between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand, the United States once more ventilated plans to include Japan within the orbit of common security, with a view to organizing a Pacific alliance, in reality an Asian edition of the North Atlantic Pact, with Japan as its nucleus, and with the rearmed Japanese Army as its main force.

The most fanatical aggressor in the world, whose true character was completely revealed during World War II has joined forces with a new aggressor, in an alliance casting Japan in the role of criminal No. 1 of a new war. Premier Yoshida, on August 4, representing the Japanese aggressors, announced to the world that their intention is to make the Police Reserve Corps a basis for building a national army, and that "a new Japan will lead Asia onto the world political arena."

But, perhaps, honorable delegates, you will ask: "What, then, are the Japanese doing?" This is a very important question. For had not the Japanese people struggled for peace, they would already have repeated their past mistakes and allowed themselves to be led by the militarists onto the road of national and racial extinction; this course is one the citizens of Japan are themselves wholly determined not to follow. The Japanese people have begun to awaken, and have clearly realized that it is their grave responsibility to unite with the peoples of Asia and the Pacific regions in a common effort to eliminate the threat of the revival of Japanese militarism.

I can inform you with pride that the Japanese people have shown unprecedented bravery in their struggle against war and for the defense of peace.

We people of Japan now understand that if the crisis of a new war with Japan as base is not averted, we shall never be able to win our ardently desired liberation from the regime of United States occupation, or to establish a democratic state and live in freedom and happiness. Indeed, the characteristic features of Japanese life today are: the unemployed who fill the cities and the countryside; the slave labor and the starvation wages; the taxation that ruins homes and businesses; the prices that keep on soaring; the destruction of agriculture and industry; the extinction of national culture; and the enslavement of the entire Japanese nation. And the primary cause of all these features is the United States occupation and the revival of Japanese militarism. During the year since the signing of the San Francisco Treaty, the Japanese people have come to realize



that the separate peace forcibly imposed on them by the governments of the United States and Japan was designed to plunge the country into remilitarization and new wars of aggression, and this has roused their indignation. Would the people of any nation, faced by such dire circumstances, not desire peace from the bottom of their hearts?

It is against this background that the movement in defense of peace is penetrating ever more deeply into cities, villages, and among all classes of the people in Japan. This movement places in the forefront the opposition to remilitarization, "Hands off Korea!", the abrogation of the war treaty, the realization of an all-in peace, and on this basis it is forging ahead. For instance, the signatures in opposition to rearmament and demanding an all-in peace, collected simultaneously with those demanding a 5-power peace pact, exceed 6 million. This is typical of conditions in general. The General Council of Trade Unions of Japan, the largest union in Japan with a membership of 3 million, and the Peasant Association of Japan have also put forward peace proposals similar to those above—evidence of the strong desire for peace characteristic of the workers and peasants of Japan. Special mention should be made of the youth, students, and women who, advancing the common slogans of "Don't join the police reserve Corps!" and "Don't serve as United States mercenaries!" stand out in the foremost ranks of the anti-remilitarization struggle. They are now launching an anticonscription signature campaign, with 20 million signatures as their target. Many scholars, religious leaders, men of arts or letters, and other professional men are also taking an active part in the peace movement. While protesting against the repressions directed against the peace movement, they have also made earnest appeals to the people from rostrum and pulpit, in articles, on the street, and at meetings: "If deprived of freedom now, the Japanese people will once more be plunged into war."

The popular movement, embracing numerous industrialists, financiers, leaders of political parties, progressive personalities from various groupings, workers and townsfolk to demand the restoration of trade relations with China and the Soviet Union, is growing in strength. For instance, Diet Member Tomi Kora, Kei Hoashi and Ex-Diet Member Kisuke Miyogoshi, braving the persecution of the United States army and the Yoshida government, attended the Moscow International Economic Conference and subsequently signed in Peking the Japan-Chinese Trade Agreement to the value of 30 million pounds sterling. On their return they were enthusiastically welcomed by the people throughout the country. This illustrates the broadness of the movement. The vital significance of the movement lies in the fact that the Japanese people who are suffering from the blockade imposed by the United States and Japanese fomenters of war as the result of the separate peace, are going ahead themselves to build peaceful, friendly relations between themselves and the Soviet Union and China, on their own account. It shows that the Japanese people is about to blaze a trail which will assuredly lead to the building of peaceful friendly relations with the peoples of Asia and the whole world.

Well above 1 million people throughout the country have taken part in person in the election of more than 400 candidates as delegates to the peace conference of the Asian and Pacific regions. The reason why the Japanese people are giving such strong support to the conference is that they look upon it as the way to peace.

The United States Government pretends that the majority of the Japanese people support the United States-made separate treaty of San Francisco. This is completely false. As our glorious fighter for peace, Frederic Joliot-Curie, put it at the extraordinary session of the World Peace Council, "No one can be deceived by such assurances; the enormous demonstrations, such as those of May Day last \* \* \* are too revealing." Mr. Gordon Schaffer, chairman of the British Peace Committee, also stated at the same council session: "The Japanese people demonstrated on May Day with a unanimity of purpose which showed to the world that they will not stand idle while these attempts are made to plunge them again into war." Hence the extraordinary session of the World Peace Council declares: "The World Peace Council salutes the heroic struggle of the Japanese people for peace, independence, and democracy against the forces of militarism and war."

I must point out with emphasis that the Japanese people entertain the hope that in the course of waging such struggles for the sake of peace, we may win the friendship of the peoples of Asia, join with them, and carry on normal trade with the countries of Asia and the Pacific regions on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. This has become the urgent common demand of every grouping of the Japanese people.

The Japanese people are fully convinced that, though there be countless obstacles and difficulties in their way, and though blockade and isolation is enforced by the foreign occupying power and the reactionaries at home, they do not stand alone; the Japanese people, just as the other peoples of the Asian and Pacific regions, stand in the ranks of peace. No, the Japanese people not only stand in the ranks but are right in the forefront. We regard it as our highest honor to struggle to the uttermost in defense of peace in Asia on what is the largest eastern base of the fomenters of world war. We who have been waging a life-and-death struggle for the prevention of a new war in Asia, express the heartfelt wish that the peoples of the Asian and Pacific regions may unit in unity and courageously advance our common cause of defeating war and winning peace. How can this be done? We believe that the urgent need is for Japan to conclude a general peace with all the countries concerned, to oppose the war-making separate treaty and to prevent the revival of Japanese militarism.

The sources of unendurable suffering today to the Japanese people are foreign occupation, the revival of Japanese militarism and the war crisis aggravated by the San Francisco Treaty. We feel their bitter effects. The conclusion of a separate peace with Japan has trampled under foot the Potsdam declaration, which was won at the cost of the blood of the people of the whole world, betrayed the interest of the Japanese people and threatened peace and order in Asia. All who abhor the revival of Japanese militarism, oppose aggressors and demand peace cannot allow this war treaty to remain valid. We believe that the time has come to demand the substitution of a peace treaty for this war treaty, and to begin the struggle for this aim. This is a great cause, not only for the Japanese people but also for all the peoples of the Asian and Pacific regions. It is an international obligation and a duty to peace to substitute an all-in peace treaty for the separate peace treaty, and we must wage persistent struggle to achieve it.

What then are the contents of the all-in treaty that we demand? This was made clear in the resolution on the Japanese question adopted at the extraordinary session of the World Peace Council. It is: Foreign occupation forces must be withdrawn from Japan, foreign countries must be forbidden to establish military bases in Japan, the sovereignty of the Japanese people must be kept intact, and their right to peaceful and democratic development must be recognized. These are, as the World Peace Council has repeatedly advocated, the inherent and inalienable democratic rights of the people. If it be recognized that the independence and sovereignty of a people should be respected, and that internal affairs must not suffer foreign intervention, then it is perfectly possible for all peoples, irrespective of their different political systems and ways of life, to co-exist peacefully, to develop trade relations on a basis of equality and exchange according to needs; on this basis it will become possible to settle international disputes by peaceful negotiation and thus eliminate the scourge of war. This is the basic principle for the preservation of peace. We can clearly see that it is precisely the frustration of this rightful claim, whether in Europe or in Asia, that has subjected all the peoples to the threat of war.

#### ON THE JAPANESE QUESTION

Victor James, Leader of the Australian Delegation

The rise and expansion of Japanese militarism was the cause of considerable apprehension in Australia for many years. The aggressions against China in the 1930's gave rise to great indignation and anxiety. Following the attacks of 1931 and 1937 various movements developed in Australia in support of the Chinese people. By 1937 the Japanese militarists were encroaching on Hopei Province. When, in 1938, the Australian Government sold pig iron to the Japanese militarists, wharf-laborers in Port Kembla (New South Wales, Australia) refused to load this war material on the ships. The conservative government then passed repressive legislation to enforce the loading of this cargo—the Dog Collar Act. This struggle was one of the most important in the history of the Australian labor movement. The struggle was summed up by the eminent Australian jurist and former Governor-General Sir Isaac Isaacs in these words:

"The men refused to engage to put the iron on board solely because they would, as they conscientiously believed, thereby become accessories in helping Japan in a war of aggression, and in the bombing of inoffensive civilians. The government intervened to force them to load the pig iron."



Later Australian workers refused to load wool, tin, lead, and other war materials for Japan. The man who led these struggles for peace should be with us here today. He is Jim Healy, federal secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation of Australia, 1 of the 23 Australian delegates refused passports to come to this conference. The government which refuses them passports is the same kind of government which helped arm the Japanese militarists in 1937 and right up to the time of the Japanese attack on Australia in 1941.

When Japanese militarism set out to conquer all Asia and the Pacific in 1941, the Australian people found themselves engaged in a bitter struggle to protect their homeland. Japanese forces bombed Australia's northernmost port and came within a few miles of invading Australia. Thousands of Australians suffered as prisoners of the Japanese. The threat of invasion was only ended in 1944 by Australian, American and other troops.

The defeat and disarming of Japan, together with the renunciation of war written into the Japanese Constitution led to the belief that Japanese militarism was forever eliminated. The Potsdam agreement stated that Japan's war-making power would be destroyed. The basic postsurrender policy for Japan, adopted by representatives of the 11 nations which resisted Japanese aggression stated as its first objects:

"To complete the task of physical and spiritual demilitarization of Japan by measures including total disarmament, economic reform designed to deprive Japan of power to make war, elimination of militaristic influences, and stern justice to war criminals, and a period of strict control."

At the end of the war the Australian people believed that this policy would be carried out and that a peace-loving, democratic, and demilitarized Japan would result. Under the Allied agreements the responsibility for the control of Japan was placed in the hands of a Four Power Control Commission comprising representatives of China, U. S. S. R., United States of America, and the British Commonwealth. In recognition of Australia's particular interest in the Japanese question, an Australian, Mr. McMahon Ball, was appointed as British Commonwealth representative. He resigned because of the failure of the Australian Government to support his stand for genuine four-power control of postwar Japan.

His book *Japan, Enemy or Ally?* made it clear to the Australian people that Japan was completely under American domination; the war criminals had been treated leniently or even allowed to go unpunished; that there had been no real democratization of Japan and that the root sources of Japanese militarism remained untouched.

In 1951 John Foster Dulles visited Australia. The purpose of his visit was clear—to insure that the Australian Government would place its signature to his separate Japanese Peace Treaty, a document which betrayed the security and future of the Australian people. When the terms of the treaty were made public there was an immediate and widespread outcry in Australia against it. The vast majority of Australians were shocked to find that prewar Japanese militarism was to be forthwith revived. Both the Potsdam agreement and the basic postwar surrender policy were betrayed by this separate peace treaty of the United States Government.

Opponents of the treaty not only included the peace councils, but ranged all the way across to members of the government party such as the former Prime Minister W. M. Hughes who said it was "treason" to rearm Japan. Leaders and members of ex-servicemen's organizations opposed it; there was great bitterness among former prisoners of war of the Japanese and of the relatives of those who died in POW camps. The Anglican Archbishop of Sydney (Archbishop Mowl), Gen. Gordon Bennett, and the New South Wales' Attorney General (Mr. Oliver Evatt) were among the many public figures who joined in the mass movement of protest.

There was strong opposition from the business community. Under the terms of the the treaty Australia was obliged to give most-favored-nation treatment to Japan in relation to her trade with Australia. This aroused alarm and hostility amongst Australian manufacturers, particularly those in textiles and light industry. The threat became even clearer when it was announced that 32 ships had been chartered for the Japan-Australia run.

A spokesman for the Associated Chambers of Commerce said: "Australia is wide open to attack on her markets by Japanese traders. \* \* \* Any complacency by the Australian Government on this Japanese threat must spell doom to many Australian manufacturers."

This opposition to the treaty was crystallized by the formation of the Committee Opposed to the Rearming of Japan. The committee received the support



of Australian workers, businessmen, intellectuals, ex-servicemen, over 200 clergymen of various denominations and of people in all walks of life. It collected in a short time 100,000 signatures to a petition against the remilitarization of Japan and trade clauses of the treaty which was presented to Parliament by some 300 delegates from all over Australia.

The treaty was ratified by the Government, but was opposed in Parliament by the Labor Party (the opposition) which had secured 49 percent of the votes in the previous election. Even some members of the Government party attacked the treaty in Parliament.

These facts clearly show the attitude of the vast majority of the Australian people to the remilitarization of Japan and its continued occupation by United States forces. The peace movement in Australia underwent its greatest development and expansion as a result of this campaign against ratification of the separate treaty.

At a puppet performance in the San Francisco Opera House last September the treaty was signed. The Governments of the U. S. S. R. People's China, India and Burma—nations which include half of the world's population—did not sign. And although the Australian Government signed, the Australian people did not.

The separate treaty was depicted by the Government and its powerful organs of propaganda as a measure designed to insure the security of Australia. The people know that this claim was utterly false; they knew that a rearmed Japan was a threat to Australian security and to peace in the Pacific and Asian regions.

Since then there has been ample evidence of the revival of Japanese expansionist aims. The Japanese war criminals are free and are rebuilding their battalions. Statements by Japanese politicians have been quoted in the Australian press showing that Japanese militarism intends to renew its drive to the south. The rich island of New Guinea to the north of Australia is again the object of these expansionist ambitions. The Japanese Government has requested the Australian Government to repatriate over 200 Japanese war criminals, some of who are serving life sentences for atrocities against Australians, and it was reliably reported on September 14, 1952, that the Government "was almost certain to grant the request." There are reports, too, of the resumption of Japanese ambitions to secure access to iron ore and other mineral deposits in Australia.

In being a party to the revival of Japanese militarism and expansionism, the Australian Government, headed by Mr. Menzies, has betrayed the security of Australia in the same way as it did in the 1930's when it encouraged Japanese aggression against China.

The Australian people neither wish to be the victims of revived Japanese militarism nor to fill the role of its ally in an aggressive war in Asia and the Pacific. Either path spells ruin for our land and our people.

The war plans of the United States Government have caused widespread alarm. Not only has Japan been rearmed, but a string of bases from Japan to Australia, from the Philippines to the Polynesian Islands have been built. These are clearly directed against People's China and other Asian countries and bring the menace of war to the entire Asian-Pacific region.

The same groups which have forced remilitarization and continued foreign occupation on the Japanese people have enmeshed the peoples of Australia and New Zealand in yet another war treaty—the ANZUS Pact. Under this agreement signed recently in Honolulu, Australia and New Zealand are committed to any war which the United States Government chooses to launch in the Pacific-Asian region. The Australian Ambassador in Washington (Sir Percy Spender, a shareholder in Malayan rubber companies) revealed the fact that the ANZUS Pact would commit Australia and New Zealand to supplying 1 million men for war—this out of a total population of 10 million. Spender hurriedly withdrew his statement, but it was clear to the Australian and New Zealand people what lay in store for them under the ANZUS Pact.

The separate treaty with Japan, the ANZUS Pact and the United States-Philippines Pact are the three components of the war which is being planned in the Pacific. The keystone of this plan is Japan.

Consequently the Japanese people bear great responsibility in the struggle against the revival of Japanese militarism. Their resistance to rearmament and to United States domination of their country has been received with great joy in Australia, notably the demonstrations around May 1, 1952. We want more information on the struggle of the Japanese people for peace; regular contact with the Japanese peace movement can strengthen our own struggle for peace in

Australia. Our delegation is confident that this conference will result in establishing such contact.

The Australian Government through its subservience to United States Government war plans in the Pacific faces our people with the alternatives of being the allies or the victims of Japanese militarism. Both alternatives would be ruinous and the only solution is for our people to struggle in common with the peoples of China, Japan, and other Asian and Pacific countries against the war which is being planned.

A militarized Japan is essential to these war plans. Victory in the struggle for an independent, democratic, and peace-loving Japan would be a catastrophic setback to the United States Government's plan for war on People's China and other Asian peoples who have asserted their independence.

We urge that the resolutions of this conference should contain a call to the peoples of the Asian and Pacific regions to support the struggle of the Japanese people against the remilitarization of their country and against its use as an armed base for aggressive war on other peoples.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, have you been a member of the executive committee of the China Aid Council?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. You have not.

Mr. Mandel, do we have a paper which indicates that Miss Russell has been a member of the executive committee of the China Aid Council?

Mr. MANDEL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been active in the Rosenberg case, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a publication called the New World Review?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the New World Review?

Miss RUSSELL. A monthly magazine.

Senator WELKER. Counsel, going back to your question, has she been active in the Rosenberg case, that is a very general question, and one that might be treated as rather unfair against this witness. Many people have been active in litigation, some popular and some unpopular. I wonder as to the reason for that question because I don't want to leave any inference in the record here that we are broadly shooting at a general subject like that.

Mr. MORRIS. What was that, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WELKER. You asked the question: "Have you been active in the Rosenberg case"? Now, an inference could be drawn from that question that maybe she was one of the witnesses, maybe she was one of the participants, maybe she was one of the witnesses for or against the Rosenbergs, and things like that. I don't like that form of a question.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may Mr. Mandel describe this next document?

Mr. MANDEL. I have here a circular mimeographed, headed: "Far East Reporter. To our subscribers and friends." It is undated.

Two drastic acts of ignoring the wishes of the American people have occurred during the past 2 weeks: President Eisenhower's state of the union address which indicated no plans whatever for carrying out the American people's desire for a peaceful settlement of the Korean war and the blatant unresponsiveness of Mr. Eisenhower to the nationwide, worldwide appeal for less than the death sentence for the Rosenbergs. These two acts are not unrelated: Extending the war in Asia and riding roughshod over the expressed desires and appeals of the people.

And, the linking of the Rosenberg sentence to the war in Korea, specifically by Judge Kaufman and implicitly by Mr. Eisenhower, is a measure of the psychological warfare which Washington is conducting—not against the Chinese and Korean people who well understand the true nature of American far eastern policy—but against the American people. This is a part of the increasingly hysterical measures which are being employed by our authorities to bludgeon the American people into an acceptance of a widening of the war in Asia.

All who want peaceful relations with Asia will see these connections. The Far East Reporter urges action: Wire the President and your congressional Representatives appealing for a reconsideration of the Rosenberg sentence and urging the exercise of clemency.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, did you send that letter?

You may examine it if you like.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that your signature that appears on that letter?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know an organization called the International Civil Liberties Committee?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you had any communication with that committee?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know any such committee.

Senator WELKER. May I suggest, Madam Witness, where there is a question such as that—and this is a suggestion; you have able counsel at your right, and I hope you will pardon a suggestion—where there is a question, do you know this or that, and your memory might be a little bit faulty, I think the best answer would be “I don't recall.”

Mr. REIN. Yes, I think that is what she meant, she has no recollection.

Senator WELKER. Fine.

Mr. MORRIS. I am reading now from a letter on the letterhead of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, dated June 11, 1947, which bears the signature “Maud Russell, executive director.”

Fellow Citizens:

“The reign of terror is on. Students are the victims. The faculty is next \* \* \*. The Government is using extreme methods. This story about the total reign of terror must be told abroad. It is a significant revelation of the desperate state of affairs in China.” A friend wrote us this on June 1.

Right now, in Washington, the Nanking Government is using high-pressure methods to secure a billion or a billion and a half American dollars with which to continue the civil war against which Chinese students, faculty, newspapermen, workers, and intellectuals are demonstrating.

We Americans must protest. Our protests can save thousands of lives in China, and they will let our administration in Washington know that we citizens will never sanction underwriting of the terror in China. We must demand that this Chiang Kai-shek blood bath stop. Chiang Kai-shek now depends on American dollars for his continued rule.

We urge you: send a letter of protest against these violent repressions of students to International Civil Liberties Committee, John W. Powell, chairman, care of China Weekly Review, 160 Chung Cheng Road East, Shanghai, China.

Does that refresh your recollection on that particular organization, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record?

Senator WELKER. It will be so ordered.

(The letter referred to was marked “Exhibit No. 165” and is as follows:)



## EXHIBIT No. 165

## COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY.

*New York 18, N. Y., June 11, 1947.*

FELLOW CITIZENS: "The reign of terror is on. Students are the victims. The faculty is next \* \* \* The Government is using extreme methods. This story about the total reign of terror must be told abroad. It is a significant revelation of the desperate state of affairs in China." A friend wrote us this on June 1.

Right now, in Washington, the Nanking Government is using high pressure methods to secure a billion or a billion and a half American dollars with which to continue the civil war against which Chinese students, faculty, newspapermen, workers, and intellectuals are demonstrating.

We Americans must protest. Our protests can save thousands of lives in China, and they will let our administration in Washington know that we citizens will never sanction underwriting of the terror in China. We must demand that this Chiang Kai-shek blood bath stop. Chiang Kai-shek now depends on American dollars for his continued rule.

We urge you: send a letter of protest against these violent repressions of students to International Civil Liberties Committee, John W. Powell, chairman, in care of China Weekly Review, 160 Chung Cheng Road East, Shanghai, China. An airmail letter to China costs 25 cents and will be there in a week.

Or, send a night letter cable to the same committee, using the following address: International Civil Liberties Reviewing, Shanghai. A night letter cable (with 25 words minimum) costs less than \$2.

We urge that you get your organization and other organizations in your community to send a message (air letter or cable); or that you get 3 or 4 individuals to send joint cables.

Messages to this Civil Liberties Committee—you can guess why a westerner rather than a Chinese is chairman—will be used effectively to pressure the Nanking Government and will be given wide publicity in China. That regime deeply fears American public opinion: let's give them a wave of American protests and stop this civil war and those violent suppressions of civil liberties.

Please send copies of your messages to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. We will help give it added circulation in China and we will use it to show our administration that Americans want no part in helping crush democracy in China. Act today!

Sincerely,

MAUD RUSSELL, *Executive Director.*

Senator WELKER. Miss Russell, do you know Nathan Gregory Silvermaster?

Miss RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Senator WELKER. You never met him?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever know William Ludwig Ullmann?

Miss RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever known Joan Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I have read her name in the paper, but I don't know her personally.

Senator WELKER. You have never attended any meetings where she was present, to your knowledge?

Miss RUSSELL. Not that I know of.

Senator WELKER. Do you know of Joan Hinton?

Miss RUSSELL. I have read her name in the paper.

Senator WELKER. You have read about her being a nuclear scientist; is that correct?

Miss RUSSELL. I think that is her connection.

Senator WELKER. And you have read where she is now?

Miss RUSSELL. I don't know where she is.

Senator WELKER. You haven't read the recent testimony as to her being in the People's Republic of China, a dairy farm there, which I have termed in Red China? You haven't read that?

Miss RUSSELL. Well, I may have read it, but I can't affirm it.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask you this question, Miss Russell. Do you actually believe the United States of America, through its Armed Forces, is guilty of using germ warfare in the Korean war?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You claim your privilege under the fifth amendment.

Proceed, counsel.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with an organization called Indusco?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Ida Pruitt the secretary of an organization called Indusco, Inc.?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Does Ida Pruitt reside in the same apartment with you?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. And you will not tell this committee whether or not you had any connection with the organization known as Indusco?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. Miss Russell, have you ever told anyone that you are a member of the Communist Party?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. In the many speaking tours, many places that you have testified, have you been asked whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. And had you been so asked, what would your answer have been?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You did tell them that you were the executive director of the Far East Reporter, did you?

Miss RUSSELL. I did not. I am the publisher of the Far East Reporter.

Senator WELKER. I beg your pardon. The publisher.

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator WELKER. You did tell them that you were the publisher of that?

Miss RUSSELL. Of course.

Senator WELKER. Did anyone ask you, or did you tell anyone that you were also a member of the Communist Party?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Russell, has Frederick V. Field been a contributor to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he specifically contribute \$1,000 to the support of that organization.

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did Corliss Lamont, to your knowledge, contribute \$500 to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recall a cocktail party held at the residence of Frederick V. Field in New York City on February 17, 1946, the pur-

pose of which was to foster traditional activities of the captioned organization, namely, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have any knowledge that at that meeting plans were made for the following speakers to speak at a meeting held April 3, 1946, at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, and the speakers included Hugh DeLacy, Ted White, Louis Weinstock, Sam Cannon, Bella Dodd, Phil Jaffee, and Mrs. Fred Field?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Were there several people from the State Department present at that meeting?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Johannes Steele present at that meeting?

Miss RUSSELL. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recall an article called the Tokyo Martyrs by Agnes Smedley, published in the Far East Spotlight in March 1949?

Miss RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record at this time?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 166" and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 166

#### THE TOKYO MARTYRS

(By Agnes Smedley)

General MacArthur has published accusations regarding a "Soviet spy ring" in Japan, in which he involves me. They were timed to coincide with his military conference with Army Secretary Royall and the building of a new civil-war base in south China. They coincided with Gen. Claire Chennault's book advocating new United States intervention in China and Senator McCarran's shouts for \$1.5 billion more for Chiang Kai-shek.

#### MURDERED BY JAPANESE

The report tells us that the principals in the "spy" case, Richard Sorge and Hozumi Ozaki, are dead. They are dead indeed, murdered by the Japanese militarists. To the best of my knowledge, these men were not spies and traitors, but martyrs for the Allied cause. MacArthur's own report says that it was due to their efforts that the Soviet Union was able to throw back the Nazi enemy and prevent Russia from being transformed into a German base. If it had not been for that, American and British Armies could never have landed in Normandy. We would have lost the war.

By contrast with Sorge and Ozaki, I am alive and, according to the report "still at large." If these men were "guilty" of anything and I with them, it has taken General MacArthur a long time to decide. His military intelligence chief, General Willoughby, said the report was prepared a year ago. Much earlier than that, Hozumi Ozaki's prison letters to his wife were published in Japan, where nothing can be printed without the consent of MacArthur's censors. They became a best-selling book. My name appears frequently in those letters.

There has been no secrecy about my knowing Ozaki. He was a noted writer and a correspondent in China for many years, and it was as such that I knew him. He was bitterly opposed to Japanese imperialism. He gave his life in the fight against its criminal war, for his own people and all peoples.

#### SMEARS BEFORE CHECKING

Now General MacArthur and General Willoughby defame the dead. Their sources are a mixture of Japanese secret police reports and hearsay. They do



not blush to speak in the direct words of Tojo. They have not bothered even to check with the State Department before smearing one of its officers who is also dead and cannot reply.

Among the living, they make no mention of many foreign correspondents with powerful connection who visited Japan during that time and worked with Ozaki and Sorge. They have singled me out for attack instead. Their report says that, for 20 years, my writings have "hoaxed" the United States State Department, all American correspondents who came to the Far East and the whole American people regarding the facts of life in China and that that is why I must now be "exposed." They make out all these Americans to be such poor dumb-bells that they cannot judge for themselves. I do not know of any greater insult to the American State Department, the American press and the American people.

General Willoughby says he has much more on me than has been made public. Of course he has much more on me. If he hasn't, he can go right back to the Japanese secret police, who had me on their death list for many years, and they will be glad to help.

#### WHERE WAS G2?

If General Willoughby and the United States military intelligence to which he belonged had worked as well in prewar Japan as the martyrs he now defames, there might have been no World War II. General Willoughby exclaims with horror that Sorge "plundered" the files of the Nazi Embassy in Tokyo. Why didn't he do it and stop the attack on Pearl Harbor? It was his job. What were our intelligence officers doing in Japan in those years? If I know them, they were probably going to cocktail parties.

The Japanese and the Chinese people call Sorge and Ozaki "the Tokyo martyrs." MacArthur now calls them spies and traitors for working against Tojo. Why doesn't MacArthur consult his Japanese police files and report on the Americans who worked with Tojo? Those real spies and traitors were everywhere before the war. Their activity helped make Pearl Harbor possible. I met them in this country and in China. Our authorities know who they are but do not molest them, or tell the American people. Today they are still well-paid "respectable" citizens.

Generals MacArthur and Willoughby are using hit-and-run tactics.

General MacArthur's mother was a Virginia lady, and I hear he prides himself on being a Virginia gentleman. I say he is a Virginia ham actor. He sits there like a star-spangled god, hiding behind the legal immunity which he enjoys as a high United States official and heaves rocks at the reputations of private citizens. His purpose is to cover up the failure of our policies in the Far East, which like his behaviour are a disgrace to America.

In conclusion, and with only this comment, I quote from two news items which subsequently appeared, one in the New York Times and one distributed by Associated Press.

The New York Times report, February 16, said:

"Washington, February 15.—The Army admitted today that the report on the Sorge spy ring in Japan, formally issued by its public information division last Thursday, did not represent Army policy. Some Army officials, who were not present when the long report was made public, went on also to say they believed a "public relations faux pas" had been committed for which only the Army could take responsibility."

The Associated Press item (February 19) said:

"Washington, February 19.—The United States Army, under criticism for issuing its recent report of wartime Soviet espionage in Japan, admitted today that it had blundered. Col. George S. Eyster, Deputy Chief of the Army's public Information Division, said among other things that the Division had no proof at hand to back up the charge in the report that Agnes Smedley \* \* \* was a Russian spy."

The irresponsible smear has done its front-page damage; the so-called retractions are late, weak and in the back of the newspapers. The retraction, in such cases, rarely catches up with the lie.

Mr. MORRIS. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record at this time a translation which I think Mr. McManus can identify for the committee.

Senator WELKER. A translation of what?

Mr. MORRIS. Articles about Agnes Smedley.

Mr. McMANUS. The subcommittee asked the Library of Congress for a translation of the series of articles which appeared in the Kuang Ming Daily, May 6, 1951, which were written on the occasion of the commemorative services to Agnes Smedley in Peking. This was a ceremony a year after the death of Agnes Smedley in England when her ashes were sent to Peking, China. And this is a translation which the Library of Congress gave us.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go in the record?

Senator WELKER. It is so ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 167" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 167

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,  
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1956.

Mr. ROBERT C. McMANUS,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McMANUS: Your request of December 28 for the translation of 6 articles from the Kuang Ming Daily, May 6, 1951, has received the attention of our Chinese Section.

Two copies of the translations, together with the original Chinese text, are transmitted herewith.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN G. BEAL, Jr.,  
Acting Chief, *Orientalia Division.*

Caption for the series of articles: "Special Issue in Commemoration of the American Revolutionary Writer Miss Smedley."

(The 6 articles which follow have all been translated from the Kuang-ming jih-pao, Peking, May 6, 1951, p. 3.)

No. 1. IN COMMEMORATION OF OUR DEAR FRIEND AGNES SMEDLEY

(By Mao Tun (i. e. Shen Yen-ping))

Today we are commemorating the first anniversary of the death of the American liberal writer and correspondent, Miss Agnes Smedley \* \* \*. In all she had spent a total of 12 years in China. It was the most difficult period in the Chinese revolution. Miss Smedley's first visit to China was in 1928; her first book relating to China, called *Chinese Destinies*, was published in 1933. This book is a record of blood and tears shed by the Chinese peasants. Her second book, entitled "*China's Red Army Marches*," was published in 1934. This book gave the world a real picture of the Chinese Communist Party and its armed forces, the Red army which was composed of laborers and farmers. It also exposed the disgraceful rumors—manufactured by the reactionary imperialist blocs—regarding the Chinese people's liberation movement. Her third and fourth books, *China Fights Back* and *Battle Hymn of China*, were published during the war of resistance. In them she forcefully pointed out that the Chinese Communists, not the Chiang Kai-shek group of bandits, were leading the Chinese people in their war of resistance against Japan. Miss Smedley had planned to write a biography of Chu Te, but it was never completed because she was in illness and poverty.

\* \* \* \* \*

After 1947 it was apparent that the Chinese people's revolution would succeed and that the American imperialists and their running dogs, the Chiang bandits, would lose. To fight a hopeless battle, the American imperialists feverishly prepared for new aggressive wars. The administration became increasingly Fascist. One would get in trouble if he spoke out against war or if he righteously advocated for peace. Progressive American people were being constantly persecuted. Miss Smedley, of course, was no exception. This shameful persecution reached its climax in February 1949, when warmonger MacArthur accused Miss Smedley as a "Soviet spy."

\* \* \* \* \*

Last June the American imperialist flagrantly launched a war of aggression against Korea and Formosa, which endangered peace in Asia and the world. Owing to the valiant resistance of the Korean people's army and our volunteer army, more than 70,000 of the American aggressors were annihilated. Temporarily we had smashed the plan of the American imperialists to enlarge the war. But the aggressors would not accept the lesson of defeat. Instead they intensified their military preparation at the expense of their own people's blood and tears. At the same time, they entered into a peace agreement independently with Japan and started to rearm her with the idea of making her people cannon fodder. In Europe meanwhile the American imperialists rearmed Western Germany. They rejected the Soviet proposals to safeguard world peace. The Truman government and its backers, the Wall Street warmongers, were plotting a new aggressive war to destroy world peace. They not only imperiled the people of the whole world, but also the people of the United States. They were not only the murderers of Smedley; they were the enemies of all peace-loving people. Although Miss Smedley is now dead, the peoples of the whole world, including those of the United States, are following the path of righteousness which Miss Smedley traversed. With courage they will organize to oppose the sinful plan of the American imperialists to conquer the world and to slaughter its people.

\* \* \* \* \*

### LIFE OF MISS SMEDLEY, A WARRIOR

(By Ting Ling (i. e. Chiang Ping-Chih))

It is by no means easy under the American imperialist-fascist system of government to steadfastly cherish peace and truth. Likewise it is hard not to be swayed by wealth and power, or not to yield to force under duress. As far as I can see, Miss Smedley is one of those who defied force and power \* \* \*.

\* \* \* She gained knowledge by direct contact with revolutionists and made a visit to Soviet Russia. She understood that there were two camps in the world: the revolutionary, righteous camp comprising the workers of the whole world, and the reactionary camp which is the militarist, imperialist, and Fascist camp. Miss Smedley chose the former camp, and came to China. From her contact with the Chinese people and the revolutionary movement for more than 20 years, she had never changed her attitude. She ardently loved the Chinese people, the Chinese revolution, and the Chinese armed forces and their leaders \* \* \*.

\* \* \* She got herself interested in revolutionary ideals in early life, and was determined to dedicate herself to revolutionary work \* \* \* she left the United States and went to Berlin, which was the center of the Indian revolutionists. All the progressive Indians there knew Miss Agnes Smedley.

\* \* \* She came to China in 1929 \* \* \* She came to China as a correspondent of the Frankfurter Zeitung in Germany at a time when Chiang Kai-shek's white terror enveloped the whole of China shortly after the great revolution.

\* \* \* After she came into contact with the leftist intellectuals, she had a better understanding of the revolutionary aspirations of the Chinese people. Through these contacts she collected much material related to the revolutionary movement of the Chinese Communists in Kiangsi, Fukien, Anhwei, Honan, Hupeh, Hunan, and other places. She had conversions with revolutionary workers who came to Shanghai from Red areas. These heroic revolutionary anecdotes, together with the fighting records of the Red army of workers and farmers, bloomed beautifully in her heart. She worshipped them and their splendid war deeds. She wrote report after report which she sent out to the world. \* \* \*

\* \* \* During her stay in Shanghai, Miss Smedley not only wrote articles, but also helped in establishing relations between the leftist intellectuals and international progressive organizations, such as the New Masses and other magazines in the United States \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*



Employing different methods, she worked among foreigners in Shanghai, talked to them, solicited contributions, and organized them as communications agents for the revolutionary leaders and guided them. She said to them often "Once you understand truth, you should plan what to do accordingly." She mobilized and directed some people to the Red areas. She helped the Red relief work, and participated in the work of the Alliance for the Protection of Human Rights sponsored by Sung Ching-lin, Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, Lu Hsun (i. e., Chou Shu-jen), Yang Hsin-fo, and others.

Chinese reactionary writers like Hu Shih and Ting Wen-chiang hated her bitterly. Hu Shih proposed complaining to the Frankfurter Zeitung in Germany that she had been conspiring with the Chinese Communists and demanded that the agency dismiss her. They intimidated her on these grounds. She was thus forced to leave the news agency, and lost her status as a correspondent \* \* \*

In November 1936, she reached Sian which was a stronghold of reaction. Chiang Kai-shek summoned a military conference there, and started to suppress patriotic movements. Chang Hsueh-liang, who was stationed in Sian, Yang Hu-ch'eng, and many other military leaders of the Northeast and the Northwest had just accepted the proposals of the Chinese Communists to consolidate and unify the fighting front. Many Communists were in Sian, as well as members of the Democratic League. Miss Smedley who was confronted with such complicated and tense political situation became greatly encouraged. When Chiang Kai-shek was detained on December 12, Miss Smedley was overjoyed. She knew Chiang Kai-shek was fundamentally reactionary and was the bitter enemy of the Chinese people. He would not humble himself before the people. But Miss Smedley did not understand thoroughly the complicated nature of the Chinese revolution because at one time she wondered why Chiang Kai-shek was released. Nevertheless the Sian incident strengthened her determination to join the Eighth Route Army. She proceeded to Yen-an, the holy place of Chinese democracy.

She went to the headquarters of the Eighth Route Army where she met Generals P'eng Te-hui, Jen Pi-shih, Ho Lung, Kuan Hsiang-ying, Lu Ting-i, Yang Shao-k'un, and others. It seemed to her that she was having a reunion with members of her own family whom she had not seen for a long time. She held many pleasant conversations and asked all sorts of questions. In her daily contact with new things and new problems, she was kept exceedingly busy, yet she took time out to write articles to report what she had seen.

In the spring of 1937, she went to Yen-an and stayed in the city, leading a frugal life like any other comrade. She spent most of her time talking to General Chu Te with the purpose of writing his biography \* \* \*.

The War of Resistance started on July 7. She followed the troops in Taiyuan, and reached the front at Wu-t'ai. She moved with the headquarters, passed through the Tai Hang Mountains, and was stationed in a village near Lin-Feng. Besides enduring hardships of a military life, she even took care of other comrades \* \* \*.

In 1938 she went to Wuhan. Frequently she used the battles at P'ing Hsing Kuan and Yang Ming Pao as subjects for her reports. She exhibited overcoats, swords, binoculars, bags, gas masks, and other articles captured by the Eighth Route Army. With proceeds from contributions and royalties from her writings, she bought medical supplies, gloves, and wind glasses and sent them to the Eighth Route Army front \* \* \*.

She also went to the New Fourth Route Army and brought medical supplies to the front. She finished writing her third book, China Fights Back and her fourth book, Battle Hymn of China. In these books she differentiated between love and hatred; she wrote them with enthusiasm. She exposed the intrigues of American imperialism toward China and revealed the infamy and dissipation of bandit Chiang Kai-shek. She praised the heroism, tenacity, determination in resisting Japan, and the selfless spirit of the Eighth Route Army and the Chinese people. She extolled their spirit of sacrifice in liberating the people, and in struggling toward a successful revolution. Her books were widely acclaimed by progressive people; they were translated into Russian, German, Chinese,

and other languages \* \* \*. Although under extreme economic oppression, she continued her propaganda work on behalf of the Chinese revolution.

Her enthusiasm for revolutionary work made her very active. Wherever she went, she would attract a crowd and win their sympathy for herself and her work in opposing American imperialism \* \* \* frequently she organized meetings to give speeches and sponsored discussion clubs. When she went to the country, she organized the women students in nearby colleges and invited Chinese revolutionists in the United States to talk about Chinese problems and conditions in China. Gradually she trained herself to be an eloquent speaker. She was persuasive in her talks. Her writings were so convincing that they drew the attention and sympathy of her readers \* \* \*

\* \* \* General MacArthur, as commander-in-chief of the Allied Forces, accused her as a spy of Soviet Russia not under arrest. He blamed her for her relation with two Japanese revolutionary martyrs who were loved by the Japanese people. All the American newspapers carried this news in big type on the front pages. What is behind all this? The reason is that during the war of resistance, many American correspondents came to China. Some of them went to Yenan and the Eighth Route Army front. They had observed with their own eyes two different types of China. Seeing from the angle of an American small capitalist class, they could not but realize that the policy of assisting Chiang in destroying China was not favorable to the United States. So their statements regarding General MacArthur's intrigues were unfavorable. Therefore MacArthur and the controlling class of the United States wanted to intimidate or warn these people. Together with anti-Soviet intrigues of Wall Street, they chose Miss Smedley, a true friend of China, to be their scapegoat. But Miss Smedley was uncompromising and untouched. Although this plot was treacherous and malicious, it was not successful.

\* \* \* Her publishers were unwilling to accept the biography of General Chu Te for publication unless she revised it. But she continued to write about China when she got hold of any material. She distributed her articles freely. Whenever there was any chance she wanted her friends to have her material incorporated into their writings, or to use it in debates.

\* \* \* She passed away this day a year ago—May 6, 1950. At the time of her death, she told her friends that she wanted to give her belongings to General Chu Te and have her ashes sent to Peking, China. She could not come to China while she was living, but she wanted her ashes to be buried in Chinese soil. Now her ashes have been brought over to Peking and will be interred in the indestructible soil of the People's Republic of China \* \* \*

#### DAUGHTER OF THE EARTH

(By Lao She (i. e., Shu Ch'ing-sh'un))

The first time I met Miss Smedley was in September 1946. Before then I had heard of her.

The place I met her was Yaddo, a large park in New York State. The park covers more than 10,000 acres; there are pine woods, small lakes, rose bushes, buildings, and individual study rooms all scattered among the pine trees. The park belonged to a private citizen who was a millionaire and a connoisseur of the arts. After the owner's death, the beneficiaries of the estate set up a committee and made the place a receiving center for artists to do creative work. It was opened in 1926; up to the present more than 500 artists have been entertained in that park, with all expenses paid by the committee. The garden was exceedingly beautiful and the location was quiet and tranquil, an ideal place for people to do creative work without disturbance. When I was invited as a guest at Yaddo for a month, Miss Smedley was already there working on her biography of General Chu Te.

Whenever possible she made every effort to promote the causes of the Chinese (Communists) in the liberated area and of Soviet Russia. In so doing she did not step out to make any statement to the point of hysteria. For example twice she worked among newly returned American veterans from the war, and made efforts to dissuade them from following the old veterans in doing reactionary work. She asked me to go with her and let me tell them how corrupt and

cruel the Chiang-Kai-shek government was. Then she immediately followed with explanations telling them how good the Chinese Communists in the liberated area were, for fear of arousing suspicion on the part of the poorly educated soldiers that she was trying to ask them to join the Communist Party. In another instance, when discussing the world situation with a British author staying at Yaddo, she made every effort not to blow up all at once. That British author had participated in the Spanish Civil War and he was bitter toward fascism. But, like many other British intellectuals, the author, while opposing fascism, stood in defense of the reactionary policies of the British Labor Government toward Russia. Miss Smedley was very clever realizing that if she persisted in praising Soviet Russia she would be putting forth fruitless effort, or even would cause angry embarrassment for both. She always pointed out that the "Soviet structure of government is the now ideal, the new experiment, and therefore the bright future of mankind for the whole world. Therefore, we must not criticize Russia for certain things she does but we must be farsighted for the sake of Soviet Russia and the future happiness of all mankind. If we denounce Russia merely on the basis of the remarks made by other people, our ideal would be diminished and the bright future of mankind would be obstructed." Such tender, highly principled remonstrances were very persuasive to those intellectuals who were susceptible of being swayed one way or the other.

On account of her, Yaddo was subjected to investigation later. It was accused of being a hideout for dangerous elements and a place for spreading dangerous thoughts. There were many progressive artists who were guests at Yaddo throughout the years, but Miss Smedley was the most notoriously denounced.

Once at a conversation with her at Yaddo I mentioned the impoverishment of the Chinese writers on the mainland. She immediately asked me to draft a letter, and typed copies and mailed them to progressive American writers. As a result, I received more than fourteen hundred dollars in contributions which I deposited in a bank. I was unable to send the American money to China, but she again helped me by writing to a friend living in Shanghai and by requesting him to transfer the funds to the person in charge of the Chinese Writers' Association. \*\*\*

\*\*\* Even after her death she gave her bones to the Chinese people, because she knew that the Chinese revolution was the people's revolution. Rest in peace, Daughter of the Earth, because you are now sleeping in the soil which was won by the victorious people's revolution.

#### MISS SMEDLEY, A TRUE FRIEND OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE

By Wu Yun-fu

We remember that before the Sino-Japanese conflict began, Miss Smedley, while under surveillance of the imperialist elements and Chiang Kai-shek's secret police, gave constructive assistance to our revolutionists and progressive members in Shanghai.

At present the American imperialists are madly committing aggression and slaughter in Korea, causing the Korean people to experience an unprecedented grave disaster. We should adopt Miss Smedley's attitude of fighting for the right and emulate her noble international spirit by aiding Korea and resisting against the United States in order to completely fulfill the mission of guarding international peace.

#### MISS SMEDLEY, A GREAT WARRIOR FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

By Ma Hai-te

Miss Agnes Smedley came to Shanghai at the time when Chiang Kai-shek betrayed his comrades after the revolution, thereby spreading reaction and terror over the whole city. During those darkened days, many people with democratic inclination were arrested, punished and murdered by the servile hounds of the foreign imperialists; foreign progressive elements were captured and put in prison; charges were leveled against those who showed the slightest tendency to progressiveness.



She stayed in Shanghai and gathered around her revolutionary friends and bolstered them with her earnest and indomitable spirit. She helped the determined comrades to carry on their work required of them at that time; she assisted the underground fighters, collected and dispatched abroad news from the veteran Communists in Kiangsi; she held meetings with the students and assisted them to carry out their revolutionary activities; she took part in starting an anti-Japanese magazine called Voice of China, to which she frequently contributed articles signed with her pen name "Rusty Nails" \* \* \* She participated in every type of revolutionary activity when called for at that time. I recall her busy moments: seeking medical supplies and forwarding them to the troops at the front; looking after the clothing problem of a man about to take a dangerous assignment; working with an interpreter on news of the Red army activities; and typing her articles to be sent abroad.

She inspired many persons to join the revolutionary movement by setting a good example herself, by her persistent struggle, and also by her untiring indoctrination and propaganda efforts. My awakening and ultimately my determination to join the Chinese Red Army in 1936 was due to her influence and help. Her deep and strong conviction in the victory of the Chinese Revolution and in the Chinese Communist Party movingly affected me and those who were associated with her. \* \* \*

At her home in the Pai En apartment house in Shanghai, she often invited close friends to dinner and encouraged them. Her friends had to come to her home in a roundabout way, for her house was often under the surveillance of the Kuomintang secret police and her guests were also being shadowed.

\* \* \* Let us commemorate her according to her desired way—by positive action—by unflinching, continuous action, and by unity in our fight until the final complete destruction of imperialism from the earth (Feb. 19, 1951, Peking).

#### I WILL NEVER FORGET MISS SMEDLEY

By Li Te-ch'uan

I saw Miss Smedley several times when I was in the United States. The following two meetings gave me a very deep impression, which will never be obliterated from my memory.

It was in the spring of 1948 when I first met her. She had been invited to give a speech at the China Week meeting sponsored by the American Far East Democratic Policy Committee. My husband, Feng Yu-hsiang, and I were invited to take part in this big meeting which was held on 38th Street, New York City. A huge crowd turned out at the meeting. The great majority of the people were workers from clothing manufacturing plants. The leaders of this meeting were Miss Lo Mu-te, Miss Smedley, the Negro singer, Mr. Robeson, Mr. Feng Yu-hsiang, and I. All of us stood on a platform specially installed on a big truck. After one of the leaders announced the formal opening of the meeting on the loud speaker, the first speaker was Miss Smedley who sharply criticized the American Government's policy in assisting Chiang Kai-shek to start a civil war. She stated, "Now the war has ended; American troops should be withdrawn immediately from Chinese soil" \* \* \*

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, there is only one bit of unfinished business at this hearing. Mr. Mandel, the research director of the committee, has gone through the files of the Far East Reporter, the Far East Spotlight, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and has compiled a list of 36 individuals who have been associated with the United States who have been connected in varying ways with the aforesaid publications and organizations. I was wondering if they may go into the record at this time with a description of exactly what their associations with these publications have been.

Senator WELKER. I think perhaps in fairness to the witness she should have a chance to look at this list to see if there is some error. And if there is some error, she may point it out.

I am sending it down to you, Miss Russell. This is a list prepared by the research director of Government employees, United States Government employees, either former or present, who are connected with the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and its official organ, Far East Spotlight, and ask you whether or not you recognize any of those names.

MISS RUSSELL. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Senator WELKER. You claim your privileges under the fifth amendment?

Miss RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. May that list go into the record with a caveat that it purports only to be a compilation made by Mr. Mandel, research director of the committee, in the course of trying to determine to what extent individuals connected with the United States Government have been associated with these publications and these organizations?

Senator WELKER. Yes, with a special reference that maybe some of them now are not connected with the Government, former and present men employed by the United States Government. That will go into the record with that stipulation.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 168" and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 168

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES CONNECTED WITH THE COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY AND ITS OFFICIAL ORGAN, FAR EAST SPOTLIGHT

Abaya, Hernando J.: Former political reporter of United States Embassy in Manila; former employee Philippine Research and Information Section, headquarters United States Army in the Far East. Speaker for Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, writes guest column for Far East Spotlight, January 1947, page 3.

Abrams, Herbert K. (Dr.): Former major in United States Public Health Service in China; later regional medical officer for UNRRA in Shantung. Speaker for Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.—CDFEP Information Bulletin, September 1946.

Ariyoshi, Koji: Former first lieutenant with United States Army in China—attached to United States Army observer group at Chinese Communist headquarters; later psychological warfare representative of the OWI at Yen-an. Writes guest column for Far East Spotlight. Far East Spotlight, February 1947, page 3. Consultant, Far East Spotlight, March 1949.

Bernard, John T.: Former Congressman. Member, board of directors, Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Bernstein, David: Former United States adviser to Philippine Government—Far East Spotlight, October 1947, page 7.

Bisson, T. A.: Former adviser, Government Section, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, Tokyo, Japan; principal economist, Board of Economic Warfare, 1942–43. Consultant, Far East Spotlight, March 1949, CDFEP.

Capitman, William: Former special agent, United States Army Counter-Intelligence in Japan. Writes for Far East Spotlight, July 1948, page 15.

Carlson, Evans F.: General, United States Marine Corps. First chairman, CDFEP letterhead February 11, 1947. See quote in Far East Spotlight, December 1949–January 1950, page 21. Deceased. Author books on China.

Chapman, Abraham: Formerly on editorial staff of Army newspaper, the Daily Pacifican (fired by General MacArthur). Writer for Far East Spotlight. See Worker, July 7, 1946, page 9 editor Fraternal Outlook. Wrote article for Far Eastern Survey (IPR). Member executive committee, CDFEP letterhead, April 18, 1951, writes for Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Chu Tong: "In 1942 and 1943 Mr. Tong was on a confidential mission to the Orient for the OWI."—Daily Worker, May 13, 1949, page 3. Editor China Daily News. Lectures for Jefferson School of Social Science. Member executive committee CDFEP, writes for Far East Spotlight.

Coffee, John M.: Former Member of Congress. Sponsor, CDFEP, letterhead April 4, 1942.

Deane, Hugh: Employee, Office of the Coordinator of Information. Contributor, Far East Spotlight, July 1948.

De Lacy, Hugh: Former Member of Congress. Member, board of directors, Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Doyle, Dorothy: Ex-UNRRA nurse in China.—Far East Spotlight, February 1948, page 1.

Falconer, Douglas: Former UNRRA official in China.—Far East Spotlight, May 1949, page 13.

Fast, Howard: Army special film project, 1944. Member staff OWI, overseas December 1942–November 1943.—Sponsor, Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Foster, John: Ex-member, United States Information Service in China.—Far East Spotlight, March 1949, page 13.

Friedman, Julian: Former United States labor attaché in Shanghai. Writes column for Far East Spotlight, April 1947, pages 3, 5.

Gollobin, Ira: Chairman, American Veterans of the Philippines Campaign—must have been in the Army. Signer of call to Conference on China and the Far East (October 18–20, 1946). Member board of directors, CDEF.—Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Hagelberg, Gerhard: Served in Asia during war, with Signal Corps.—Far East Spotlight, August–September 1947, page 6. Consultant, CDFEP, Far East Spotlight, March 1949.

Hernandez, Amado V.: Major in Lt. Col. Bernard Anderson's Guerillas during occupation of Philippines. Writer, Far East Spotlight, February 1949, page 10.

Hutton, Alphaeus: Former teacher, Howard University.—Far East Spotlight, August–September 1947, page 3.

Keeney, Philip O.: Former libraries officer, SCAP, Tokyo. Treasurer, CDFEP.—Far East Spotlight, June 1949.

Lealtad, Catherine (Dr.): "Was with United States Public Health Service on loan to UNRRA as a medical officer in Shantung Province (North China) for over a year."—Far East Spotlight, February 1948, page 6. Member board of directors, CDFEP.—Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Liu Tsun-Chi: Former Chief Editor of the Chinese Department, United States Office of War Information, Chungking. Editor Shanghai paper suppressed by Kuomintang. Wrote article for Far East Spotlight, July 1947, page 3.

Menefee, Selden: Social research economist, WPA, 1938–41; housing research analyst, USHA, 1941; senior psychologist, Office of Coordinator of Information, 1941–42. Sponsor, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Perlo, Victor: National Recovery Administration, Commerce Department, War Production Board, Treasury Department, writes article for Far East Spotlight urging trade with Chinese Communist Government.—Far East Spotlight, December 1949–January 1950, page 7.

Pressman, Lee: Assistant General Counsel, AAA, 1933–35; General Counsel, WPA, 1935–36. Member board of directors, CDFEP, Far East Spotlight, June 1948.

Rorkbrough, Edward: Writer for OWI—Daily Peoples World, September 28, 1946, October 3, 1946. Consultant, Far East Spotlight, March 1949.

Salisbury, Laurence E.: Occupied numerous stations in Far East as United States foreign service officer, 1920–44; former Assistant Chief, Division of Far Eastern Affairs, State Department; retired 1944 to assume present position as editor Far East Survey (IPR); consultant to CDFEP.—Information Bulletin, August 1946.

Stewart, Maxwell S.: Consultant, War Manpower Committee, 1943–44.—Consultant, CDFEP, letterhead, February 11, 1947.

Tewksbury, Donald G.: Deputy chief, Special Training Branch, Military Training Division, ASF, War Department, 1942–44—writes for Far East Spotlight, October 1950.

Wuchinich, George S.: OSS. Speaker, CDFEP, Daily Worker, April 3, 1946.

Watson, Goodwin B.: Chief analyst, Foreign Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission, 1941–44.—Sponsor, CDFEP, letterhead April 4, 1947.

Watts, Richard, Jr.: Former head, News Division, Chungking Branch, OWI—Worker, July 4, 1946. Dublin representative, United States OWI, and special assistant to American Minister to Eire, 1942–43.—Member board of directors CDFEP, writes for Far East Spotlight.



Willmott, Don: With OSS in China during war; writes article for Far East Spotlight, September 1948, page 15.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WELKER. Have you planned your speaking tour for the summer of 1956, Miss Russell?

Miss RUSSELL. I have.

Senator WELKER. Do you have the speaking tour planned with respect to the Western States?

Miss RUSSELL. I have the general areas where I am to speak.

Senator WELKER. Have you already been booked, or have you been scheduled for any of those places?

Miss RUSSELL. The details are still to be worked out, the areas where I am going to be have been made known to my subscribers, and I am waiting for them to tell me when to come.

Senator WELKER. The subscribers are the ones who do the detail work for you in arranging for these speeches?

Miss RUSSELL. I let them know I am coming, and some of them arrange meetings.

Senator WELKER. And you haven't arrived at a schedule for your next appearance in the State of Idaho?

Miss RUSSELL. No.

Senator WELKER. I think that concludes the hearing as of today.

I want to thank you, Miss Russell, for appearing before the committee. And you, Mr. Rein, for your courteous and very fine way of representing your client.

The meeting is now adjourned.

And it is further ordered that you, Miss Russell, are now released from subpoena.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

# INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

## A

	Page
Ackerman, Dr. Phyllis	329
"A Day in a Peking Prison"	388
Alabama	340, 341
Americans	328, 329, 337, 357, 396
American Armed Forces from China, Japan, and Korea	376
American-Asian relations	337
American bases	376
American combat troops	383
"American Intervention in China: Official Statements Versus Facts"	377
American policy	329
AP	346
Armed Forces	399
Asia	337, 397
Asian and Pacific Peace Conference, Peking, China, October 1952	388
"Asia and World Peace, Whither Japan? Answers by a Japanese—Toga Kameda, and an Australian—Victor James"	388
"Asia Tells the World What the United States Is Doing in Asia; Why Asia Demands Peace"	390
Asiatic Spain	329

## B

"Bandung, Asian-African Conference"	373
Berkeley	342
Bill of Rights	387
Bisson, T. A.	329
Boise	339, 340, 342
British	377
Byrnes, Secretary of State	383

## C

Caldwell	339, 340
California	325, 326, 339, 341, 342
Cannon, Sam	400
Chicago	341, 342
China	326-329, 337, 338, 347, 377, 383, 388, 397
China Aid Council	396
"China's Foreign Trade Soars—Why Can't Americans Benefit?"	367
China Monthly Review	388
"China Trade Facts"	372
China Weekly Review	397
"China: Visitors Welcome!"	373
Chinese	397
Chinese Communist	333
Chinese National Government	376
Chinese Nationalist Army in China	358
Chinese YWCA	326
Coeur d'Alene	339, 342
Colorado	341

	Page
Columbia.....	326
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.....	326,
327, 329-331, 333, 337, 338, 347, 358, 360-363, 365, 376-384, 387,	
388, 397, 399, 400, 407, 408.	
Letterhead, August 26, 1945.....	327
111 West 42d Street, New York.....	331, 347
58 Park Avenue, New York.....	384
June 11, 1947.....	397
Committee for a Democratic Policy Toward China.....	330
Communist Party.....	327, 341, 346, 399
Communist Party of New York State.....	330, 331
35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.....	330
Congress.....	393
Congressmen.....	377
"Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the People's Republic of China,	
With Editorial Introduction".....	365, 386
Constitution of the United States.....	386, 387
Craigmont.....	339
"Crisis in China: What Chiang Has Lost in Arms, Men".....	358

## D

Daily Worker.....	330-332, 346, 387, 388
May 8, 1949.....	330, 387, 388
January 16, 1950.....	331, 332
December 2, 1948.....	358
Darr, Rev. John.....	389
Daughter of the Earth.....	405
DeLacy, Hugh.....	384, 400
Dennis, Eugene.....	327
Descriptive maps of China.....	372
District of Columbia.....	341
Dodd, Bella.....	400
Dutch.....	377

## E

Eighth Route Army.....	329
Eisenhower, President.....	396, 397
England.....	326, 402
Epstein, Israel.....	329, 360
Exhibit No. 139—Letter to all sections and counties from May Miller,	
assistant organizing secretary of Communist Party of New York State,	
Robert Thompson, chairman, New York, N. Y., letterhead dated March 1,	
1949 re program for action on China policy.....	330
Exhibit No. 140—Article from Daily Worker, January 16, 1950: "Facts	
Behind The Korea Crisis: Who Started The Shooting?".....	332
Exhibit No. 141-A—Letter from Maud Russell "To my friends" re Com-	
mittee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy being forced to register as	
a subversive organization.....	335
Exhibit No. 142—Maud Russell signature.....	337
Exhibit No. 143—Far East Reporter, Maud Russell, publisher, January	
1955: Making available significant facts and analyses contributed by	
competent writers on the Far East.....	343
Exhibit No. 143-A—Far East Reporter, Maud Russell, publisher, January	
1953: Making available significant facts and analyses contributed by	
competent writers on the Far East.....	344
Exhibit No. 143-B—Maud Russell, publisher, Far East Reporter: Making	
available significant facts and analysis contributed by competent writers	
on the Far East.....	345
Exhibit No. 144—Letters from China.....	347
Military situation.....	347-349
Notes on American intervention in China.....	349-354
Living in the liberated areas.....	354-357
Order on this form.....	357
Exhibit No. 145—Article from Daily Worker, December 2, 1948: "Crisis in	
China: What Chiang Has Lost in Arms, Men".....	358-360



Exhibit No. 146—Far East Spotlight, July–September, 1949: List of officers of Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy-----	362, 363
Exhibit No. 146-A—"White Paper Confirms Our Charges"-----	364–365
Exhibit No. 147—Far East Reporter, entitled "Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the People's Republic of China, With Editorial Introduction"-----	365–367
Exhibit No. 148—Far East Reporter, entitled "State Capitalism in China"-----	367
Exhibit No. 149—"China's Foreign Trade Soars—Why Can't Americans Benefit?"-----	367–369
Exhibit No. 150—Far East Reporter, entitled "Wanted: A Far East Geneva," by Susan Warren-----	369–372
Exhibit No. 151—"China Trade Facts"-----	372
Exhibit No. 152—Far East Reporter, entitled "Formosa (Taiwan)," by Susan Warren-----	372
Exhibit No. 153—Far East Reporter, entitled "Descriptive Maps of China"-----	372, 373
Exhibit No. 154—Far East Reporter, entitled "The Truth About Indochina"-----	373
Exhibit No. 155—Far East Reporter, entitled "China: Visitors Welcome!"-----	373
Exhibit No. 156—Far East Reporter, entitled "Bandung, Asian-African Conference"-----	373–376
Exhibit No. 157—A petition to the President, the Secretary of State, and Congress: "We demand: Get out of China!" Return to Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy-----	378
Exhibit No. 157-A—Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, 58 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.: "What Are We Saying and What Are We Doing?"-----	379
Reverse side of document:	
"Do We Keep Troops in China for This?"-----	380
"Homecoming Again Delayed"-----	381
Exhibit No. 157-B—June 28, 1956, from Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy re opposition to House bill H. R. 6795 for military assistance to China-----	381, 382
Exhibit No. 158—June 24, 1947, from Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, to fellow citizens re dependence of Nanking regime on United States to save Chiang Kai-shek from defeat by his own people-----	383
Exhibit No. 159—Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy printed circular re wide support needed for Representative Delacy's resolution for immediate withdrawal of United States troops and equipment-----	384
Exhibit No. 160—Invitation, mimeographed, headed "Far East Reporter Takes Pleasure in Providing an Opportunity for Its Subscribers and Friends to meet Anita and Henry Wilcox"-----	389
Exhibit No. 161—Invitation from Mand Russell, publisher, Far East Reporter, to our subscribers and friends to an evening with Rev. John Darr-----	389
Exhibit No. 162—"Whither Japan?", introduction to pamphlet-----	390–396
Exhibit No. 163—"How the USA Curbs National Independence"-----	390
Exhibit No. 164—"Asia Tells the World What the United States Is Doing in Asia; Why Asia Demands Peace"-----	390
Exhibit No. 165—Letter from Mand Russell, executive director, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, June 11, 1947, to fellow citizens re Nanking government-----	398
Exhibit No. 166—"The Tokyo Martyrs," by Agnes Smedley-----	400, 401
Exhibit No. 167—Letter to Robert C. McManus from Edwin G. Beal, Jr., Acting Chief, Orientalia Division, Library of Congress, January 12, 1956, re translation of 6 articles from Kuang Ming Daily, May 6, 1951-----	402
No. 1. "In Commemoration of Our Dead Friend Agnes Smedley," by Mao Tun-----	402
"Life of Miss Smedley, a Warrior," by Ting Ling-----	403
"Daughter of the Earth," by Lao She-----	405
"Miss Smedley, a True Friend of the Chinese People," by Wu Yun-fu-----	406
"Miss Smedley, a Great Warrior for Peace and Freedom," by Ma Hai-te-----	406
"I Will Never Forget Miss Smedley," by Li Te-ch'uan-----	407
Exhibit No. 168—"Government Employees Connected with the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and Its Official Organ, Far East Spotlight"-----	408

## F

	Page
"Facts Behind the Korea Crisis"-----	331, 332
Far East-----	337, 338, 346, 376, 383, 386
Far East Reporter-----	337-343, 346,
360, 361, 367, 369, 372, 373, 376, 386, 388-390, 396, 397, 399, 407	337
112 West 42d Street, New York 36, N. Y-----	337
Letterhead-----	341
Letterhead, January 1955-----	341
Letterhead, January 1953-----	372
103 West 93d Street, New York 25, N. Y-----	408
Far East Spotlight-----	338, 357, 361, 363, 365, 369, 372, 373, 400, 407, 408
March 1949-----	400
Far eastern policy-----	325, 386
Field, Frederick-----	327
Field, Frederick V-----	329, 399
Field, Mrs. Fred-----	400
Fifth amendment-----	326, 327, 329-331, 333, 334, 338, 340, 341, 346, 347,
357, 358, 360-362, 376, 377, 384, 386-389, 396, 397, 399, 400, 408	339-341
Florida-----	372
Formosa (Taiwan)-----	329
Franco-----	377
French Government-----	

## G

Gerlach, Talitha-----	329, 360
Germ warfare in Korea-----	357, 399
Government-----	329, 376
Government employees connected with the Committee for a Democratic	
Far Eastern Policy and its official organ, Far East Spotlight-----	408
Grangeville-----	339

## H

Hai-te, Ma-----	406
Hinton, Joan-----	398
Hinton, Mr.-----	386
Hinton, William-----	360, 361
Hotel Roosevelt, New York City-----	400
House bill H. R. 6795-----	383
"Housing and Construction in New China"-----	389
"How the USA Curbs National Independence"-----	390
Hurley, Ambassador Patrick-----	377

## I

Idaho Falls-----	339
Idaho, State of-----	339-343, 410
"In Commemoration of Our Dead Friend Agnes Smedley"-----	402
India-----	338
Indochina-----	377
Indonesia-----	377
Indusco-----	399
Institute of Pacific Relations-----	326, 330
International Civil Liberties Committee-----	397
"I Will Never Forget Miss Smedley"-----	407

## J

Jaffe, Phil-----	400
James, Victor-----	388
Japan-----	338
Japanese-----	329

## K

Kai-shek, Chiang-----	327, 383, 397
Kameda, Toga-----	388
Kansas-----	341

	Page
Kaufman, Judge	397
Kellogg	339
Korean	397
Korean war	396, 397, 399
Kuomintang	329, 377, 383
Kuang Ming Daily, May 6, 1951	402

## L

Lamont, Corliss	399
Lewiston	339
Library of Congress	402
"Life of Miss Smedley, a Warrior," by Ting Ling	403
Ling, Ting	403

## M

Malaya	377
Manhattan	331
MacArthur, Gen. Douglas	377
McManus, Mr	401
McMichael, Rev. Jack	329
Michigan	341
Middle West	339, 341
Miller, May	330, 331
Minnesota	341
"Miss Smedley, a Great Warrior for Peace and Freedom"	406
"Miss Smedley, a True Friend of the Chinese People"	405
Missouri	341
Montana	341

## N

Nampa	339, 340, 342
Nanking Government	397
Nation, the	346
National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China	330
New Fourth Army	329
New Mexico	341
New World Review, March 1955 issue	372
New World Review	396
New York Herald Tribune	346
New York City	326, 333, 340, 341
New York Times	346, 387
North Carolina	341
North Dakota	340, 341

## O

Oakland	342
Ohio	341
Oregon	341, 342

## P

Pacific	328
Peking, China	402
Pennsylvania	341
People's Republic of China	398
People's World	346
Pope, Arthur Upham	329
Portland	342
Powell, John	360, 388
Powell, John W	397
President	383
Program for action on China policy	330
Pruitt, Ida	399





3 9999 05445 4333

## INDEX

## R

	Page
Red China.....	346, 357, 360, 388, 398
Rein, David.....	326
711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.....	326
Attorney for Maud Russell.....	326
Rosenberg's.....	396, 397
Rosenberg case.....	396
Russell, Maud (testimony of).....	325-410
103 West 93d Street, N. Y.....	325
1893, born in California.....	325
1915, graduated University of California.....	326
Studied Woodbrook College, England.....	326
M. A., Columbia, in 1945.....	326
1917-43, lived in China.....	326
Fifth amendment re Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.....	326
Publisher of Far East Reporter.....	338
Fifth amendment re Communist Party.....	399

## S

Salisbury, Lawrence E.....	329
San Francisco.....	346
Sayers, Michael.....	329
Schuman, Julian.....	388
Secretary of State.....	383
Senators.....	377
Shanghai, China.....	397
Sheehan, Vincent.....	329
She, Lao.....	405
Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory.....	398
Smedley, Agnes.....	400-402
Snow, Mrs. Edgar.....	329
South.....	339
South Carolina.....	341
South Dakota.....	341
Soviet Foreign Office.....	325
Soviet Russia Today (publication).....	372
Spotlight (publication).....	337
"State Capitalism in China".....	367
State, Department of.....	383, 400
Steele, Johannes.....	400
Stein, Guenther.....	360
Stewart, Maxwell S.....	329
Stilwell, General.....	329
Stowe, Leland.....	329
Sues, Ilona Ralf.....	329

## T

Tannebaum, Gerald.....	361
Te-ch'uan, Li.....	407
Tennessee.....	341
Terlin, Rose.....	329
Thompson, Robert.....	330
"Tokyo Martyrs," by Agnes Smedley.....	400
Truman, President.....	329, 358, 383
"Truth About Indochina, The".....	373
"Truth Also Fights for Free China".....	330, 388
Tun, Mao.....	402
23 West 26th Street.....	327
Twin Falls.....	339

## U

Ullmann, William Ludwig.....	398
United States.....	326, 361, 386, 388, 407
U. S. Government.....	408

	Page
U. S. Government employees-----	408
United States military forces-----	357
United States military personnel-----	383
United States of America-----	399
U. S. News & World Report-----	346, 387
University of California-----	326
UP-----	346
Utah-----	341

## V

V-J Day-----	383
--------------	-----

## W

Wallace-----	339
Wall Street Journal-----	346
"Wanted: A Far East Geneva"-----	369
Warren, Susan-----	369, 372
Washington-----	341, 342
Watts, Richard, Jr.-----	329
"We Demand: Get Out of China:"-----	378
Wedemeyer, Gen. Albert-----	377
Weinstock, Louis-----	400
Welker, Senator Herman-----	325
Western States-----	410
"What Chiang Has Lost in Arms, Men"-----	358
"White Paper Confirms Our Charges"-----	364
White, Ted-----	400
"Whither Japan?"-----	390
"What Started the Shooting?"-----	331, 332
Willcox, Anita-----	388, 389
Willcox, Henry-----	388, 389
Wisconsin-----	341
Woodbrook College, England-----	326
Worker-----	387, 388
Wu, Tung Pi-----	333

## Y

Yergan, Dr. Max-----	327, 329
Yun-fu, Wu-----	406

## O





# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE  
UNITED STATES

---

MARCH 13, 1956

---

PART 9

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

Boston Public Library  
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 18 1956

### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
PRICE DANIEL, Texas  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming  
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota  
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah  
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois  
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho  
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri  
PRICE DANIEL, Texas

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah  
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho  
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*

RICHARD ARENS and ALVA C. CARPENTER, *Associate Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

---

Testimony of—	Page
Lamken, Natalie.....	426
Lautman, Corinne.....	428
Montgomery, Jean.....	411
Montgomery, Jean, resumed.....	431
Sherman, Alexander.....	421
Stone, John B.....	417
Todd, Alden.....	435





# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER  
INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m. in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur V. Watkins presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland (chairman) and Watkins.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; and Robert C. McManus, investigations analyst.

Senator WATKINS. The committee will be in session.

Judge Morris, you may call your witnesses.

Mr. MORRIS. Jean Montgomery. Miss Jean Montgomery.

Chairman EASTLAND. Hold your hand up, please, ma'am.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I do.

## TESTIMONY OF JEAN MONTGOMERY, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID COBB, HER ATTORNEY

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Montgomery, will you give your full name and address to the reporter, please?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Jean Montgomery, 5041 12th Street NE., Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your occupation, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Unemployed.

Mr. MORRIS. You are a newspaperwoman?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I was.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you would give the committee a short sketch of your career, dating back to the time you were in college.

Miss MONTGOMERY. I was employed in the early thirties by the United States Government—

Chairman EASTLAND. Would you please talk into the mike, ma'am, so that we can hear you.

Miss MONTGOMERY (continuing). For about a year.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry. You went to Antioch College; did you not?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And you graduated in what year?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I spent 4 years there. I did not graduate.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Miss MONTGOMERY. I left in 1929, I believe.

Mr. MORRIS. And what was your first employment after you left Antioch College?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I had a brief experience with a marionette show. I then became employed with a women's organization that was seeking the repeal of the prohibition amendment. I next worked for the United States Government in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your employment with the United States Government in Washington?

Miss MONTGOMERY. As an administrative assistant in the NRA.

Mr. MORRIS. It what year was that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I believe it was in 1934 or 1935. I believe in 1934 or 1935.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, in 1935 you became associated with the Textile Workers Organizing Committee, did you not?

Miss MONTGOMERY. It might have been in that year. After I left my Government job, I was employed in New York with an organization known as the Paper Industries Coordinator.

Mr. MORRIS. The Paper Industries—

Miss MONTGOMERY. The Paper Industries Coordinator. Thereafter I had a number of jobs.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did Len De Caux assist you in getting that particular position?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you work for the Textile Workers Organizing Committee?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes, I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did Len De Caux get you that job?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No. Len De Caux hired me to work—no. That is correct. Len De Caux hired me to work for the Textile Workers Organizing Committee.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, at the end of 1935 and early 1936 you did secretarial work for the Rural Worker?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't recall the name. I was employed by a committee organizing farmworkers.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you associated with a gentleman named Archie Wright at that time?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Not that I recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Now will you continue? For how long a period did you do that work?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Oh, I really don't remember. I should think perhaps a year.

Mr. MORRIS. All right. What was your next employment, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Probably the CIO or the Textile Workers Organizing Committee.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year was that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I think around 1935 or 1936.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, for how long did you work for them?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I believe it was less than a year?

Mr. MORRIS. And what was your next employment after that, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. The investment management firm of Joseph W. Burden.



Mr. MORRIS. For how long did you work for them?

Miss MONTGOMERY. About 3 years, I believe.

Mr. MORRIS. That brings it down to what year?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Around 1940.

Mr. MORRIS. 1940. Now, what did you do during the war years, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. In 1941 I was employed by Tass.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now was that the last employment, then, after the Burden agency, from there to Tass?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And for how long did you work for Tass?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Until July 1955.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, what was the nature of your work for Tass news agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I was a reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, would you give us a brief description of your duties as a Tass reporter? Were you working, for instance, in New York, or were you working in Washington?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I worked in New York for 4 years. I was then assigned to Washington in the fall of 1945, assigned to cover Congress. My duties were those of any reporter, to cover hearings, legislation, debates, and other things of interest to readers.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you cover Capitol Hill, in other words?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you also cover the White House?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Later, beginning, I believe, around 1952, I was given the additional assignment of covering Presidential and the Secretary of State's press conferences.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, in that capacity did you attend off-the-record news conferences?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you also cover the State Department?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you tell us briefly of your work covering the State Department?

Miss MONTGOMERY. The work included sending news reports on whatever news emanated from the State Department: Speeches, hand-outs, press conferences.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, when you would gather your news, or material for your news stories, to whom did you turn that material over, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. A news story was filed, usually by telephone—

Mr. MORRIS. By you?

Miss MONTGOMERY. By me.

Mr. MORRIS. To whom?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Dictated over the telephone, and it went by teletype to the New York office of Tass for transmission to Moscow.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. In other words, you reported directly to New York rather than to the head of the Washington bureau?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was the head of the Washington bureau?

Miss MONTGOMERY. At what time?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, give us the period of time that you were with Tass.

Miss MONTGOMERY. In the beginning of my employment in the Washington bureau, the manager was Larry Todd. Thereafter the chief of that bureau was Federov. He was succeeded by Bolshakov, who was in charge when I left.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Bolshakov is a Russian, is he not?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And at the time of your departure in July 1955 what was the makeup of the Tass agency here in Washington, the personnel office?

Miss MONTGOMERY. There was Mr. Bolshakov, another reporter, Mr. Paramonov, and either one or two technical workers in the office.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us who they were?

Miss MONTGOMERY. One was named Kondakova.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you spell that for the reporter?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I believe it was K-o-n-d-a-k-o-v-a.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what was the name of the reporter that you mentioned after Mr. Bolshakov?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Paramonov.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that the gentleman who sits over here at the end of the press table, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And why did you leave Tass in July 1955?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I was dismissed.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the reason for your dismissal?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Reorganization of the staff.

Mr. MORRIS. What do you mean by that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is what I was told.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. In other words, you know nothing more than that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you get any separation pay at that time?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What did it amount to?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Including final salary, vacation pay and severance pay for 14 years, the total was something over \$5,700.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, when you were served with a subpoena by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee a few weeks ago, what did you do? What was your first reaction?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Well, that is rather hard to recall.

Mr. MORRIS. For instance, did you call the head of the Tass bureau in New York, Harry Freeman, to let him know that you had been served?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes; I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, why did you do that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I requested that Tass pay whatever legal expenses might be involved for me in the proceeding.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, are they doing that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't know. The proceeding is still going on.

Mr. MORRIS. At the time of your executive session, you said that issue was uncertain, and that you did not know what the outcome was going to be?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. And it is your testimony here this morning that you do not know whether or not Tass is going to pay the retainer for your attorney representing you here today——

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Or any other legal expenses you may incur?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. What did Harry Freeman tell you on that issue?

Miss MONTGOMERY. As I told you during our rehearsal session, he said that it would have to be taken up with the home office of Tass, because such contingencies were not provided for in the budget.

Mr. MORRIS. And he still, to this day, has not let you know what the answer is going to be?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Miss Montgomery, what credentials did you have as a Tass correspondent?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I had credentials from Tass News Agency, a card saying that I was an accredited representative of the news agency. I had a card admitting me to the White House and one admitting me to the Congress.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Is that all? Were there any other credentials?

Miss MONTGOMERY. During the immediate postwar years, I might have had others. There was a time, during the war, when reporters were required to carry a great many credentials for almost every Government agency. But I don't recall what other agencies I had in those early years.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, Miss Montgomery, I think, awhile ago, you said that you did not attend off-the-record press conferences at the White House. Did you attend conferences at the White House at which off-the-record statements were made?

Miss MONTGOMERY. At the White House?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't recall any.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you attend any such conferences, at which off-the-record statements were made, on Capitol Hill?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes, frequently.

Mr. MORRIS. Frequently. That was a frequent situation, that you, as a member of the working press, found yourself in, was it not, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And is it your testimony that, for the most part, your assignment here on Capitol Hill and in the White House and at the State Department and at New York was very much the same as any other reporter's would be in carrying out his assignment for his news agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. For the entire part.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Miss Montgomery, were you a member of the Communist Party the day before you took up employment with Tass?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I won't answer that question, because I am afraid it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you a Communist the day you took up your employment with Tass?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I would give you the same answer to that question.



Mr. MORRIS. Were you a member of the Communist Party a day after your employment with Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You were not. Did you effect a resignation from the Communist Party for the purposes of working at Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you effect a resignation from the Communist Party on the day that you took up employment with Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you effect your resignation the day after you began to work with Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, I don't believe that I did.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not believe you effected a resignation?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't recall, really, as I told you in executive session. I don't recall any such incident as that.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did Tass have a regulation that working members of that organization should not be members of the Communist Party?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Tass had a regulation that its employees could not engage in any political activity whatsoever, and could belong to no political party.

Mr. MORRIS. And for that reason you did not continue any membership that you may have had with the Communist Party; is that right?

Miss MONTGOMERY. For that reason, I did not participate in any political activity, or belong to any party.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Miss Montgomery, did you attend meetings of the Robert H. Hall newspaper unit of the Communist Party held at the home of Mr. J. B. Stone, 2901 18th Street NW.?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Mr. Morris, I have already testified—

Mr. MORRIS (continuing). In Washington?

Miss MONTGOMERY (continuing). That I was not a member of any party. I was not a member of any group or unit or cell or fraction or subsidiary, any organization whatsoever. I did not attend any such meetings.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Miss Montgomery, the question I believe I asked you was, did you attend any meetings of the newspaper unit of the Communist Party held at Mr. Stone's home, 2901 18th Street NW.—

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS (continuing). In Washington, D. C.?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. MORRIS. In the year 1947?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, never.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you meet with people in Mr. Stone's home?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Mr. and Mrs. Stone were friends of mine. I have been in their home on social occasions.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, it is your testimony that whatever meetings you had with Mr. J. B. Stone at 2901 18th Street NW., were social meetings and not meetings of a political nature?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Were there political items discussed at those meetings?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is very difficult to recall. I would presume there were.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Miss MONTGOMERY. But none of us were living in a vacuum.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might interrupt the testimony of Miss Montgomery at this time and ask Mr. J. B. Stone to testify.

Chairman EASTLAND. Yes. Call Mr. Stone.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you step down temporarily, Miss Montgomery?

Mr. Stone, would you come forward, please?

Mr. FORER. May we have the lights and cameras off while the witness is testifying, Judge Morris?

Chairman EASTLAND. Gentlemen—wait a minute, sir. You cannot take pictures. He has asked not to. He has that right under our rules.

Would you gentlemen step in the back, please?

Stand up, please, sir. Hold your hand up.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STONE. I do.

# **TESTIMONY OF JOHN B. STONE, WASHINGTON, D. C., ACCOMPANIED BY JOSEPH FORER, HIS ATTORNEY**

Mr. MORRIS. Would you give your name for the record?

Mr. STONE. John B. Stone.

Mr. MORRIS. Where do you reside, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. 2901 18th Street.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is your present employment?

Mr. STONE. I am self-employed.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you describe what you are doing?

Mr. STONE. I publish a newsletter entitled "On the Washington Record."

Mr. MORRIS. And what is your circulation for that publication?

Mr. STONE. It is not very big. I just started. I am trying to build it up.

Mr. MORRIS. All right.

Now, Mr. Stone, you have been a newspaper man most of your working life, have you not?

Mr. STONE. I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give us briefly what your newspaper career has been?

Mr. STONE. In 1922, I was publisher of the Billings Searchlight for 9 months. That might have been 1921. I think it was 1922. It was during the Wheeler campaign in Montana.

In 1923, I was radio editor of the Chicago Evening Post. From 1924 to 1929, I was feature writer for the Chicago Daily News. From 1929 to 1930 and maybe 1931, part of 1931, I was a rewrite man for the Chicago Evening American. I was a public relations man in Chicago for a year or two. Then I joined the Chicago Daily Times. I was a rewrite man and feature writer, night city editor, assistant city editor, and city editor, for various newspapers up until 1938, I believe.

I worked for the Herald American for a year. I am not sure—no. The Herald Examiner. I beg your pardon. The Examiner. I was then public relations account executive for the Illinois Central Railroad, for De Kuyper Co., an advertising concern.

I came to Washington in 1939 or 1940. I think it was 1940, to set up the first publicity organization for the defense bond sale. I went from there to Treasury procurement and from there to OPA.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, just a minute. This is your Government employment now you are telling us about, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what your first Government assignment was?

Mr. STONE. At the Treasury Department, to set up the first public relations organization for the sale of defense bonds.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your title at that time?

Mr. STONE. I am not sure. I think I was Assistant Director of Public Relations, but I am not sure of the title.

Mr. MORRIS. For the Treasury Department?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And after that?

Chairman EASTLAND. What year was that?

Mr. MORRIS. What year was that, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. It was 1940.

Mr. MORRIS. And after that?

Mr. STONE. I went to the procurement department of the Treasury, the Procurement Division, as a liaison man between the procurement officers and the economic agencies, like the WPB, OPA, and various departments of the Government that set the rules for buying things. From there I went to OPA. I wrote publicity for the Solid Fuels Division, for the Oil Division, and for a number of others, gradually moving up to where I was head of the desk that cleared all of the publicity pieces.

Mr. MORRIS. What was that, Mr. Stone? You were at the desk that cleared all these publicity features?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Of OPA; is that right?

Mr. STONE. That is correct. There was a short period I was asked to go over to OWI. I worked there for a few months.

Mr. MORRIS. What did you do with OWI?

Mr. STONE. I wrote special assignments. One that I had was on war housing, the progress that was being made on war housing; one on the daily work of the chaplains in the armed services. I think those were my two major assignments in the short period I was there.

Mr. MORRIS. And after that, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. I went to Newsweek Magazine as correspondent here.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, immediately after the OPA assignment, you went to Newsweek?

Mr. STONE. Well, there was a period in which I was looking around for something constructive to do.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you work for Newsweek?

Mr. STONE. As I recall, it was from 1944 to 1947.

Mr. MORRIS. Then did you go to the Bridgeport Herald?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you were a Washington correspondent of Newsweek at that time, were you not?

Mr. STONE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And were you a Washington correspondent of the Bridgeport Herald?



Mr. STONE. I was.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the general nature of your assignments for those two publications?

Mr. STONE. For Newsweek I did economics, until the period of post-war strikes, when somebody discovered that I knew something about labor organizations, and I was given that assignment. I wrote a column once a week called Labor Trends, and I covered labor developments in the capital.

Mr. MORRIS. And after you left your work at the Bridgeport Herald, what did you do?

Mr. STONE. The entire city was my beat on that. I wrote anything that I thought would interest the Bridgeport Herald.

Mr. MORRIS. And your next assignment?

Mr. STONE. I was public relations director. I was retained by the Bureau of the Budget, or suggested by the Bureau of the Budget, to handle public relations on the World Congress of Statisticians at the Statler Hotel—no; at the Shoreham Hotel.

Mr. MORRIS. When was that?

Mr. STONE. I don't exactly remember the year. It must have been 1948 or 1949. I have a letter of commendation from the Budget Bureau on that.

Mr. MORRIS. And then after that?

Mr. STONE. I worked for the Federated Press.

Mr. MORRIS. Now——

Mr. STONE. There was a period in there, to keep the record straight, where I worked for the National Guardian and the Federated Press, both.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I wonder, Mr. Stone, if you could tell us whether or not you were connected with the Robert F. Hall newspaper unit of the Communist Party here in Washington.

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you reside at 2901 18th Street NW.?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Are Communist meetings held in your home?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a gentleman named Alex Sherman?

Mr. STONE. Yes, I have met Al Sherman around. I know him quite well.

Mr. MORRIS. And who is he? What does Alex Sherman do?

Mr. STONE. I don't know. He has been a newspaperman.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Do you know his wife, Polly Sherman?

Mr. STONE. I have met her.

Mr. MORRIS. She has been at meetings in your home?

Mr. STONE. I don't know. She may have been. I visited them. Did you say at meetings?

Mr. FORER. Would you clarify what you mean by meetings?

Mr. MORRIS. Have they been to your home?

Mr. STONE. I don't know whether they have visited my home or not, really. I have visited them. I remember having breakfast with them one Sunday morning. I would be delighted to have them come to my home.

Chairman EASTLAND. Answer his question, now.

Mr. STONE. I did, sir. I don't know. I don't recall whether I was——

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, what did you understand Judge Morris to mean by "meetings in your home"? You have answered the question——

Mr. STONE. I thought—I am answering the question.

Chairman EASTLAND. Sir?

Mr. STONE. I am answering the question.

Chairman EASTLAND. I said, you answered his question by saying "No."

Mr. STONE. Oh. I thought he had asked me, had they visited my home.

Chairman EASTLAND. He asked you if they had attended meetings in your home. Now, what did you understand him to mean by "meetings"?

Mr. STONE. Well, a visit, it seemed to me, would be a meeting in my home.

Chairman EASTLAND. You understood him to mean a visit in your home; is that right?

Mr. STONE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Has Jean Montgomery been in your home?

Mr. STONE. I am not quite sure. I think she has been. I have known her for a long time socially.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Has she attended meetings in your home?

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. STONE. What do you mean by meetings? I mean, if there were 2 or 3 people there, we, sometimes, as other people do very often, in fact, have a dinner and invite a few friends out, or sometimes we invite a few friends over to watch TV. It is hard for me to answer that without knowing exactly what you mean by a meeting.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you describe to us exactly what kind of situations prevailed when Miss Montgomery did visit your house?

Mr. STONE. As I said earlier, I am not quite sure that she did. I think she has been at my home just in a purely social manner. But I have known her for quite some time. We were newspaper people covering the Hill here.

Mr. MORRIS. How recently have you seen her?

Mr. STONE. Well, I saw her on the witness stand just now.

Mr. MORRIS. Naturally. Earlier than that, Mr. Stone.

Mr. STONE. Oh, I would have to guess at that. I would say a year or so ago.

Mr. MORRIS. A year or so. Well, is it your testimony that she is a person that you have known and whom you see and visit with from time to time?

Mr. STONE. Oh, she is a person I know and have known and have visited with from time to time, rather over dozens.

Mr. MORRIS. You will not tell the committee, now, however, whether or not you are a member of the newspaper unit of the Communist Party here in Washington?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason I have given before.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Stone, were you a Communist when you did that work for the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you a Communist today?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you worked for the United States Government from 1940 to—

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Chairman EASTLAND. Do you know Harry Dexter White?

Mr. STONE. No, I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were a newspaperman here in Washington after the war?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you did newspaper work in Chicago prior to the war?

Mr. STONE. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Chairman EASTLAND. Have you any questions?

Senator WATKINS. I have nothing.

Chairman EASTLAND. You may stand aside.

Mr. FORER. Is the witness excused?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, you are excused.

Mr. FORER. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. You are excused, Mr. Stone. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Alex Sherman.

Mr. FORER. Senator, may we have the pictures off for this witness, too?

Chairman EASTLAND. Yes, sir. Gentleman, no pictures.

Hold your hand up, please, sir.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF ALEXANDER SHERMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY JOSEPH FORER, HIS ATTORNEY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Sherman, will you give your full name and address to the reporter?

Mr. SHERMAN. My name is Alexander Sherman.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your address?

Mr. SHERMAN. 1742 17th Street NW.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is your occupation?

Mr. SHERMAN. At the present time I am self-employed, distributing motion pictures.

Mr. MORRIS. What motion pictures do you distribute? To whom?

Mr. SHERMAN. Various types of films; primarily documentaries.

Mr. MORRIS. And for whom are you distributing films?

Mr. SHERMAN. For various companies: Hoffberg Productions, in New York.

Mr. MORRIS. What was that? I did not hear.

Mr. SHERMAN. Hoffberg; Brandon Films; Artkino; and Contemporary Films.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give us a description of your work in distributing films here in Washington?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, this is the distribution of what is known as nontheatrical motion pictures. In other words, 16-millimeter films. They are intended primarily for use by organizations and schools.



Mr. MORRIS. And for how long have you been doing that work?

Mr. SHERMAN. Since February or March of last year, I believe.

Mr. MORRIS. What did you do prior to that time?

Mr. SHERMAN. Prior to that, I was also self-employed in publicity and in the operation of the Georgetown Theater in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. For how long did you run the Georgetown Theater in Washington?

Mr. SHERMAN. From the latter part of 1950 up until 1954, the latter part of 1954.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Sherman, what schools have you put these pictures into, that you are distributing?

Mr. SHERMAN. What schools?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, it varies. Mostly there have been some colleges and some public schools and school systems.

Chairman EASTLAND. Name them, please, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, the Cleveland Public Library——

Chairman EASTLAND. Is that Cleveland, Ohio?

Mr. SHERMAN. Cleveland, Ohio; yes, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. St. Peter's College in Jersey City, quite a number of them, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Go ahead.

Mr. MORRIS. You tell us some more.

Chairman EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Go ahead.

(The witness' attorney consults with the witness.)

Chairman EASTLAND. Wait a minute, now. He did not ask you, Mr. Attorney, for your advice.

Mr. SHERMAN. I find it difficult, sir, to remember them all.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right. You can remember some more now. Let us name them.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, it hasn't been a very profitable business, frankly. We have had very few requests for these films.

Chairman EASTLAND. Name the others, please, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. I just find it almost impossible. I would have to refer to my records to do that.

Chairman EASTLAND. Where are your records, sir?

Mr. SHERMAN. They are at my office.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, name the others that you remember. You are bound to remember more than that.

Mr. SHERMAN. Private individuals.

Chairman EASTLAND. Who are those individuals?

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. FORER. Senator, I think he is still on your question about schools.

Chairman EASTLAND. Well, he said private individuals.

Go ahead. All right.

Mr. FORER. Are you dropping schools?

Chairman EASTLAND. All right, go ahead. Finish schools. We will go back to private individuals.

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. SHERMAN. I really don't remember any more, Senator.

Chairman EASTLAND. You do not remember any more?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not right now.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, your records will show, is that right?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, the records will show.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you mention in your testimony public schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. There may have been public schools.

Mr. MORRIS. I mean, did you say so just a few minutes ago?

Mr. SHERMAN. I said, schools. I am not sure.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, you said "public school systems." That is what you said, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. There may be some public schools among them. I don't remember, Senator.

Chairman EASTLAND. You do not remember the names of the schools?

Mr. SHERMAN. They are usually school systems.

Chairman EASTLAND. You do not remember the name of a single school system?

Mr. SHERMAN. Offhand, I don't, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, you said "private individuals." Name some of those private individuals.

(The witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. SHERMAN. At this moment, I don't remember who they are.

Mr. MORRIS. What work did you do prior to—I think we had gotten back as far as your work with the Georgetown Theater.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was self-employed as a publicist, working for various clients, and also as a publicity and film consultant to the Royal Norwegian Government.

Mr. MORRIS. To the Royal Norwegian Government?

Mr. SHERMAN. Right.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us how long you served in that capacity?

Mr. SHERMAN. From 1942 through the duration of the war and 1 year following, about 1946.

Mr. MORRIS. When was the Hoffberg Film Distribution Co. organized?

Mr. SHERMAN. I don't know, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. It is a new company, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. Hoffberg Productions?

Chairman EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, for how long did you work for the Royal Norwegian Government as public relations man?

Mr. SHERMAN. From the end of 1942 through the war and 1 year after, about 1946.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what did you do before 1942?

Mr. SHERMAN. Prior to that I was handling publicity work for Columbia Pictures in Washington, and also for New York City.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what did you do before that?

Mr. SHERMAN. Prior to that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was on a newspaper as a film critic for the New York Morning Telegraph.

Mr. MORRIS. Film critic for the New York Morning Telegraph?

Mr. SHERMAN. New York Morning Telegraph.

Mr. MORRIS. How long did you hold that assignment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I would say about 3 years.

Mr. MORRIS. Prior to that?

Mr. SHERMAN. Prior to that, I was a newspaperman with a theatrical publication for about 3 or 4 years, and out of work for a period of a year.

Mr. MORRIS. What?

Mr. SHERMAN. Out of work for a period of a year during the depression.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, your wife works in the Polish Embassy, does she not, Mr. Sherman?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you presently a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse to answer on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you attended meetings of the newspaper unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse on the same grounds, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Is there a newspaper unit of the Communist Party in the city of Washington at this time?

(Witness consults with his attorney.)

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse to answer on the same basis, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, have you put these films in the Washington school system?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Sherman, you are a friend of Miss Montgomery, an earlier witness today, are you not?

Mr. SHERMAN. I know her, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And she is a friend of your wife?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And you meet with her on frequent occasions; is that right?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, to your knowledge, has she attended Communist meetings with you?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse to answer on the same basis.

Chairman EASTLAND. In the past 2 years, has she attended Communist meetings with you?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse to answer that, sir, on the same grounds.

Chairman EASTLAND. In the past year has she attended Communist meetings with you, sir?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse, again, to answer on the same grounds.

Chairman EASTLAND. In the past 6 months has she attended Communist meetings with you?

Mr. SHERMAN. I refuse to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. I think, Senator, I have no more questions of this witness.

Senator WATKINS?

Senator WATKINS. I have none.

Mr. MORRIS. You are excused, sir.

Mr. FORER. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Forer has represented several other people whose testimony in connection with the first witness here



today is much the same as these last two witnesses. I think, however, at this time it will not be necessary for the other witnesses to appear here today.

And they were who, Mr. Forer?

Mr. FORER. You have got the names there. Will you get them from Mr. Mandel? I am not very good at names.

Chairman EASTLAND. You do not know the names of your clients?

Mr. FORER. (No response.)

Mr. MORRIS. That is Corrine Lautman, Mr. Forer?

Mr. FORER. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MORRIS. From Washington, here. And Natalie Lamken, also from Washington?

Mr. FORER. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I put portions of the testimony of Natalie Lamken and Corrinne Lautman into the public record in order to make unnecessary their public appearance here today?

Chairman EASTLAND. That will be granted.

Mr. MORRIS. I have done so with the stipulation of counsel for both those clients who appeared for them in executive session.

Mr. Forer, will you have a short session with me so that the part of the executive session that does go into the record will be a fair representation of what happened?

Mr. FORER. Yes, it is.

Mr. MORRIS. And you agree that the best interests of all will be served if we put this into the public record?

Mr. FORER. If you are asking me whether or not you should put it in the public record—

Mr. MORRIS. Is it satisfactory to you, Mr. Forer?

Mr. FORER (continuing). I do not think you should. What are you asking me?

Mr. MORRIS. I mean, did you not, Mr. Forer, agree yesterday that the story could be best told if we just put the portion of the executive session testimony that bears on the particular issue here today into the record?

Mr. FORER. Yes. I said yesterday that I saw no purpose of repeating in the public session what you already had in the executive session.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. I just wanted to be sure that there would be nothing taken out of context.

Mr. FORER. Yes.

(The portion of the executive session record referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER  
INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Wednesday, February 29, 1956, Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 3 o'clock p. m., in room 313, Senate Office Building, Senator Herman Welker, presiding.

Present: Senator Welker.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel, and Benjamin Mandel, research director.

Senator WELKER. The subcommittee will be in order.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Lamken.

Senator WELKER. Will you stand and be sworn, please.

Miss LAMKEN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you will give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

TESTIMONY OF NATALIE LAMKEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HER  
COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Senator WELKER. Your name and residence, please,

Miss LAMKEN. Natalie Lamken, L-a-m-k-e-n, 1724 17th Street NW., Washington.

Senator WELKER. Thank you.

Proceed, Counselor.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your occupation, Miss Lamken?

Miss LAMKEN. Well, I have a part-time clerical job, and I also give music lessons.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Is that Miss or Mrs. Lamken?

Miss LAMKEN. Miss.

Mr. MORRIS. And what other employment? That is the only employment you have at the present time?

Miss LAMKEN. Yes, uh-huh.

Mr. MORRIS. Where do you work; where is the secretarial job?

Miss LAMKEN. It is a clerical job. I work at a weekly newspaper called the Jewish Ledger.

Mr. MORRIS. Where is that? Here in Washington?

Miss LAMKEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the address?

Miss LAMKEN. 14th and K.

Mr. MORRIS. What employment did you have immediately preceding this employment?

Miss LAMKEN. Oh, I was teaching English to foreigners.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Where did you do that?

Miss LAMKEN. At several embassies.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Which embassies were they?

Miss LAMKEN. The Hungarian, the Russian Legation, and the Polish for a short while.

Mr. MORRIS. And who were the people, who were your students in those classes?

Miss LAMKEN. They were, I guess you call them, nationals of those countries.

Mr. MORRIS. I see; who are here in the United States?

Miss LAMKEN. Yes, working here at the embassy.

Mr. MORRIS. How long were you doing that work?

Miss LAMKEN. Let me see. I would say about 3 or 3½ years.

Mr. MORRIS. What salary do you get?

Miss LAMKEN. I was paid by the hour.

Mr. MORRIS. By the hour.

Miss LAMKEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Approximately how many students did you have in each class?

Miss LAMKEN. I didn't teach by class. I taught just individuals.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

What employment did you have before that?

Miss LAMKEN. I worked at the Bureau of National Affairs, in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the Bureau of National Affairs?

Miss LAMKEN. Well, it publishes many different kinds of publications. I worked on Labor Relations Reporter, and it publishes many other things.

Mr. FORER. It publishes U. S. Law Week.

Miss LAMKEN. Law Week, Daily Report for Executives, and many other things.

Mr. MORRIS. How long were you working for them?

Miss LAMKEN. I think I was there 7 years.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Miss LAMKEN. Seven and a half.

Mr. MORRIS. What did you do before that?

Miss LAMKEN. Let me see. I am trying to think back what year that was that I came there. Oh, I know. I worked at the GE, this was during the World War II, the General Electric Co. in Lynn, Mass.

Mr. MORRIS. What did you do there?

Miss LAMKEN. I was an inspector.

Mr. MORRIS. An inspector.

Miss LAMKEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And before that?

Miss LAMKEN. That was from—I was, I think, for a year or a year and a half, in Baltimore, working as a junior caseworker in the department of public welfare.

Mr. MORRIS. In Baltimore?

Miss LAMKEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you been on the membership committee of the District of Columbia Communist Party?

Miss LAMKEN. I must refuse to answer that question, under the privilege of the fifth amendment, which affords me the privilege of not incriminating myself.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you—do you know a woman named Jean Montgomery?

Miss LAMKEN. I refuse to answer that question, for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you a Communist now, Miss Lamken?

Miss LAMKEN. I refuse to answer that question, for the same reasons.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions.

Senator WELKER. Thank you very much.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Lautman.

Senator WELKER. Raise your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony about to be given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I do.



· TESTIMONY OF CORINNE LAUTMAN; ACCOMPANIED BY HER  
COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Senator WELKER. Your name and your residence, please.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Corinne Lautman. I live at 526 Sheridan Street NW., Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you Mrs. Lautman?

· Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your husband's name?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Robert.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your occupation, Mrs. Lautman?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I am a housewife.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your last occupation?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I worked at the United office—no, that was not my last occupation. I am sorry. I worked at the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America office in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. What does your husband do now?

· Mrs. LAUTMAN. He is a photographer.

Mr. MORRIS. Where does he work?

· Mrs. LAUTMAN. He has an office in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. What does he do, though? Is he an independent photographer, or does he work for someone?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes, he is self-employed.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you just give us a brief description of his work, where he works, how he works?

(Mrs. Lautman conferred with her counsel.)

· Mrs. LAUTMAN. Well, he is a commercial photographer, and he has his laboratory and his studio together. I don't quite understand what you mean by "how he works."

Mr. MORRIS. I just really wanted the general nature of his work.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. He is a commercial photographer.

Mr. MORRIS. And he does independent photography work?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes; that is right.

· Mr. MORRIS. Has he any particular client, any outstanding client?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No. He has a number of clients, but no one in particular.

Mr. MORRIS. All right.

When did you work for the UER—

Senator WELKER. Just a moment.

Can we have some of those clients, particular clients?

(Mrs. Lautman conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. FORER. Do you know?

· Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes.

Mr. FORER. O. K.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Let me see. He has done some work for the Seco Industrial Co. He worked for some local architects. He has taken pictures for Charles Goodman. I am trying to remember the others.

· Senator WELKER. I know that is a rather hard question for you to answer. Has he done any work for any of the Embassies here?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I am not sure. I don't know whether he has or not.

Senator WELKER. Or anyone connected with the Embassies, to your knowledge?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. You have worked for Tass, haven't you?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you work for Tass?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. It was about from 1947, November of 1947, as I remember it, to 1949.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your assignment?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I was a stenographer in the office.

Mr. MORRIS. When you left Tass in 1949, what was your next job?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Then I worked for the United Electrical Workers.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. What did you do before you went to Tass?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Before I went to Tass; you mean my job before that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I had lived in New York before that. Directly before I worked for Tass, my husband and I had taken a 6-months' trip around the country. And in New York, I had worked a number of places.

Mr. MORRIS. Just your last employment.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Well, before that, it had been the National City Bank in New York; and before that—

Mr. MORRIS. What was your maiden name, Mrs. Lautman?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Pressman.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Pressman, Corrine Pressman?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you a college graduate?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No; I am not a college graduate.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Lautman, have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to testify against myself.

Mr. MORRIS. All right.

Were you a Communist during the years 1947 through 1949 while you were with Tass?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I refuse to answer, for the reason I have already given.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you a Communist now?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I refuse to answer, for the same reason.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no further questions.

Senator WELKER. May I inquire about how you received your employment with Tass?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes. When we returned to Washington, I wanted to—

Senator WELKER. From where?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. From the trip that we were taking.

Senator WELKER. Just a sightseeing trip around our United States?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes, generally that sort of thing.

Senator WELKER. I did not hear you, ma'am.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes, it was that sort of thing.

I wanted to work for a publication or a news service, and I went to the National Press Building, because I knew that most magazines and news services had their offices there, and I applied at a number of offices, and I was offered a job at Tass, and it seemed an interesting job and it was a well-paying one, so I accepted it.

Senator WELKER. Who did you apply to?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I was interviewed by Larry Todd.

Senator WELKER. Introduced to whom?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. You mean——

Mr. FORER. She said "interviewed."

Senator WELKER. I am having a little trouble hearing. I am sorry. And he interviewed you?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Did he ask you whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No, he did not.

Senator WELKER. Do you know whether or not he knew you were at any time a member of the Communist Party?

(Mrs. Lautman conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No, he wouldn't have known.

Senator WELKER. He would not know?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. I don't quite understand your question. Would you repeat it again?

Senator WELKER. We will read it.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No.

Senator WELKER. And nothing was discussed between the two of you as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. That is quite right.

Senator WELKER. Did he interview you about your past work or your writing experience, stenographic experience?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. Yes, he did.

Senator WELKER. Did he interview you with respect to any organization that you perhaps belonged to?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No. All that we discussed concerning organizations was that it was emphasized that people who were employed by Tass were not to have any political activities. But we discussed nothing concerning membership, my membership in any organization.

Senator WELKER. By "political activity," I take it you mean you could not take any activity in the Republican Party, Democratic Party, or any other party.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. That is right.

Senator WELKER. He did not say anything to you with respect to whether or not you would take any activity with respect to the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, anything like that?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No. No.

Senator WELKER. Do you have something you want to offer?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No. I would just like to repeat that he didn't ask me about my associations in the past with any organizations. He only emphasized that it was important that Tass employees not have any political activities at all, with any party at all.

Senator WELKER. Now, did anyone suggest that you go to Tass to look for work?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No.

Senator WELKER. Not a soul?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No, not that I remember.

Senator WELKER. Not that you remember.

Mrs. LAUTMAN. That is right.

Senator WELKER. You certainly would remember if somebody had suggested it, would you not?



Mrs. LAUTMAN. I am quite sure that no one suggested it. It was quite the way that I have said.

Senator WELKER. Fine. I am not trying to mislead you, entrap you, or anything like that.

I have no further questions.

Mr. MORRIS. Just one question.

Are you related to Lee Pressman in any way?

Mrs. LAUTMAN. No, I am not.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no questions.

Senator WELKER. Thank you very much.

I would like the record to show the firm association.

Mr. FORER. Forer and Rein.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Montgomery, will you resume the stand?

### TESTIMONY OF JEAN MONTGOMERY—Resumed

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Montgomery, you know Alexander Sherman, do you not?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes, I do.

Mr. MORRIS. And you know his wife, Polly Sherman?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. And Alden Todd of Federated Press is a good friend of yours?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. As is Nat Einhorn?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What does Nat Einhorn do now?

Miss MONTGOMERY. He does public relations for the Embassy of Poland.

Mr. MORRIS. And what does Polly Sherman do?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I am not sure what her job is. She works at the Polish Embassy.

Mr. MORRIS. And you testified in executive session that Natalie Lamken, about whom we have just spoken, is a friend of yours?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. A person you have associated with while you have been employed here in Tass?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes; I have known her.

Mr. MORRIS. The same with Corinne Lautman?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. A friend of yours with whom you have associated during the period?

Miss MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. However, it is your testimony that while you were associated with these people, you yourself were not a member of the Communist Party?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. However, you will not tell us whether or not you were, prior to your employment with Tass, a member of the Communist Party?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Montgomery, do you know Alex Sherman to be a Communist?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not know that?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know whether or not Polly Sherman is a Communist?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know whether or not Alden Todd is a Communist?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Miss Montgomery, were you active in the Committee for the Rosenbergs in any way?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No; I was not.

Mr. MORRIS. You made a contribution to their campaign, did you not?

Miss MONTGOMERY. As I told you in executive session, Mr. Morris, I bought the transcript of the Rosenberg trial, which I understood was being sold, partly, to raise money for the committee. I don't recall any other contribution.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

In other words, you bought the transcript in order to raise money for them, or did you buy the transcript for Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I bought the transcript for my own personal use, to read.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you buy it for Tass News Agency?

Miss MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge, does Tass News Agency have a copy of that transcript?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Mr. Yuri Novikov, Miss Montgomery?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I have met Mr. Novikov.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, who was Mr. Novikov?

Miss MONTGOMERY. He was a member of the diplomatic corps of the Soviet Embassy.

Mr. MORRIS. And what were your associations with him in Washington?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I met him at social affairs.

Mr. MORRIS. And did you discuss the work of Tass News Agency with him?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't recall. I don't think so.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

You know, do you not, Miss Montgomery, that he was asked to leave the United States as a person *persona non grata* in 1953?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I read about that in the papers; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that because he was engaged in espionage?

Miss MONTGOMERY. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, it is your testimony that you only know about that particular episode what you read in the press?

Miss MONTGOMERY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I put the Department of State's press release, dated January 15, 1953, on the question of the request that Yuri V. Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy at Washington, depart because he was *persona non grata* to the United States Government, on the record?

Chairman EASTLAND. It is so ordered.

(The press release referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 169" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 169

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For the press, January 15, 1953, No. 27

The Department of State has been working with the Department of Justice in connection with the espionage case of Otto Verber et al., against whom an indictment has been opened today. Upon the arrest of the defendants and in view of the information contained in the indictment regarding the activities of Yuri V. Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy at Washington, the Department has notified the Embassy that Mr. Novikov is persona non grata to this Government and has requested his immediate departure from the United States.

The text of the note follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, January 14, 1953."

"The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and states the following:

"The Government of the United States has ascertained that Yuri V. Novikov, second secretary of the Embassy, has engaged in activities incompatible with his status as an accredited diplomatic official.

"Therefore, this Government is impelled to declare Mr. Novikov persona non grata. The Embassy is requested to make arrangements for his immediate departure from the United States."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, do we have anything from the Justice Department on the question of Mr. Novikov?

Mr. MANDEL. We have a release dated January 15, 1953, from the Department of Justice on the case of Yuri V. Novikov.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman EASTLAND. It will be admitted into the record.

(The press release referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 170" and reads as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 170

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For immediate release, Thursday, January 15, 1953

Attorney General James P. McGranery announced today the indictment of two naturalized citizens on charges of espionage for Soviet Russia.

The indictment, naming Otto Verber and Kurt L. Ponger, both of New York City, charged them with conspiring with Yuri V. Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

The indictment was returned sealed by a District of Columbia Federal grand jury January 13, 1953. It was opened on the basis of their being taken into custody in Vienna, Austria, by the United States Army. They will be brought to the United States for arraignment.

Verber, 31, was born in Vienna. He was naturalized May 8, 1943, on the basis of his service with the United States Army, in which he was commissioned second lieutenant December 8, 1944. He served on a military intelligence team in Europe until February 8, 1945, and subsequently was employed as an interrogator for the War Crimes Commission in Nuremberg. Presently he has been residing in the American Zone of Vienna and is enrolled under the GI bill of rights at the University of Vienna.

Ponger, 39, was also born in Vienna and first entered this country as a seaman February 21, 1940. He was naturalized February 17, 1943. Ponger, reportedly a brother-in-law of Otto Verber, having married one Vera Verber, entered the United States Army June 11, 1943. He was also employed subsequently by the War Crimes Commission and has been recently residing in the Soviet Zone of Vienna, and reportedly is also studying under the GI bill of rights.

The indictment, resulting from combined investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and an investigative agency of the United States Army, is in two counts. Both counts charge 14 overt acts in pursuance of a conspiracy.



The grand jury charged that beginning on or about June 18, 1949, Verber and Ponger conspired in Washington, Vienna, and Salzburg, Austria, and at other places unknown, with Novikov and others unknown to violate the espionage statutes. The grand jury charged that the plan was to communicate, deliver, and transmit or attempt to do so, and to induce each other and divers other persons unknown to communicate, deliver, and transmit to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, documents, writings, sketches, plans, maps, notes, instruments, and information relating to the national defense of the United States with intent and reason to believe that the same would be used to the injury of the United States and to the advantage of Soviet Russia.

It also further charged that they conspired to obtain and collect information relating to intelligence and counterintelligence activities of the United States Army and United States Air Force and relating to the numbers, personnel, disposition, equipment, arms, and morale of the Army and Air Force, the location, size, equipment, organization, and other features of military establishments, airports, aircraft, and other establishments connected with the national defense of the United States, and information in possession of the United States Armed Forces relating to strength, organization, disposition, and capacity of foreign armed forces.

The grand jury further charged that a further part of the said conspiracy was that the defendants and coconspirators would be employed in various capacities and activities within the United States, in Austria, and at other places unknown for the purpose of being in a position to deliver information relating to the national defense of the United States to Soviet Russia. It charged that they arranged through the conspiracy to receive instructions, directions, and messages from Soviet Russia; that they agreed to induce, engage, and employ other persons for the purpose of making contact with others in this country and Austria who by reason of employment were in a position to be acquainted and familiar with and were in possession of or had access to national defense information; and that they agreed to offer and promise sums of money and other valuable considerations to such persons who might be able to assist them.

The second count charged them with conspiring to go upon, enter, and otherwise obtain information concerning aircraft, works of defense, places connected with the national defense, and places in which aircraft, arms, munitions, and other material and instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, stored, all for the purpose of obtaining information with the intent and reason to believe that it would be used to the injury of the United States and to the advantage of Soviet Russia.

The 14 overt acts charged in each count were the same. They are:

(1) On or about June 18, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did solicit and attempt to obtain a list of informants of American intelligence agencies.

(2) On or about July 19, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did solicit and attempt to obtain a list of employees of the United States engaged in certain intelligence and defense work.

(3) On or about August 3, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take, receive, and obtain information regarding an American intelligence operative and informant.

(4) On or about September 26, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did transfer to a Government employee a sum of money as remuneration, expense, and payment for information relating to the national defense of the United States.

(5) On or about October 11, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take, receive, and obtain information concerning a United States Air Force installation.

(6) On or about November 15, 1949, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take, receive, and obtain an American intelligence report.

(7) On or about May 16, 1950, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take, receive, and obtain an American intelligence report.

(8) On or about May 25, 1950, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take obtain, and receive information relating to the national defense of the United States.

(9) On or about July 18, 1950, at Vienna, Austria, defendant Verber did take, obtain, and receive information relating to the national defense of the United States.

(10) On or about December 29, 1950, at Salzburg, Austria, defendant Verber did attempt to arrange a meeting between an agent and representative of a foreign government with an employee of the United States.

(11) On or about January 1, 1951, at Salzburg, Austria, defendant Ponger did meet and confer with an employee of the United States.

(12) On or about January 4, 1951, at Salzburg, Austria, defendant Verber did meet and confer with an employee of the United States.

(13) On or about January 4, 1951, at Salzburg, Austria, defendant Ponger did arrange a meeting at Washington, D. C., between an employee of the United States and coconspirator Novikov.

(14) On or about April 12, 1951, at Washington, D. C., coconspirator Novikov did meet and confer with an employee of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions of this witness, Senator.

Chairman EASTLAND. You may stand aside. You are released from your subpoena.

Miss MONTGOMERY. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Counsel, in the event that we may want to recall Miss Montgomery at any time, will you stipulate for the record in her presence that a telephone call will be all that is necessary to have her return?

Mr. COBB. A telephone call, together with due notice.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. You will try to give you as long a notice as we can.

Mr. COBB. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Alden Todd.

Mr. TODD. I prefer not to have those things in my eyes, if you please.

Chairman EASTLAND. Do you want the lights out?

Mr. TODD. Thank you, sir.

Chairman EASTLAND. Turn the lights out.

Stand up, please, sir. Hold your hand up. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TODD. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF ALDEN TODD, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID COBB, HIS ATTORNEY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Todd, will you give your full name and address to the reporter.

Mr. TODD. Allen Todd, no middle initial; 4872 Chevy Chase Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your occupation, Mr. Todd?

Mr. TODD. I am a news reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. For what news service?

Mr. TODD. With the Federated Press.

Mr. MORRIS. How long have you been with the Federated Press?

Mr. TODD. I think I first came with them in February of 1946.

Mr. MORRIS. And you are the son of Larry Todd, who has been the ranking Tass correspondent here in Washington for many years; is that right?

Mr. TODD. Yes. He retired 3 years ago, or 4 years ago.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I understand. Now, what did you do before you took up employment with Federated Press?

Mr. TODD. I was in the United States Army, Parachute Infantry.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that immediately preceding your employment with Federated Press?

Mr. TODD. I think I took off about 3 weeks between Army service and the Federated Press.

Mr. MORRIS. And prior to your Army service, Mr. Todd, what did you do?

Mr. TODD. I was employed in the Sun Shipbuilding Co., in Chester, Pa.

Mr. MORRIS. And when did you graduate from college?

Mr. TODD. 1939.

Mr. MORRIS. From what university?

Mr. TODD. Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORRIS. Swarthmore College. Do you have any graduate degree?

Mr. TODD. I can't quite hear you.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have a graduate degree? Have you done any graduate work?

Mr. TODD. I have no degree. I think I took a course or two after graduating, at Temple University, but no degree. I think I got a point or two.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Todd, have you associated—have you been a good friend and rather regular associate of the first witness here today, Miss Jean Montgomery?

Mr. TODD. Well, I would say I was a friend. I don't know how regular "regular" is.

Mr. MORRIS. You describe it as best you can.

Mr. TODD. I would say I have seen her off and on here over a period of 10 years, the way I see many others.

Mr. MORRIS. But she is a personal friends of yours, too, is she not?

Mr. TODD. I would say so, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Todd, are you now a Communist?

Mr. TODD. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist a year ago?

Mr. TODD. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist 2 years ago?

Mr. TODD. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Todd, is there a date somewhere between—it is now March 13—somewhere between March 13, 1954, and March 13, 1955, that you would change the answer to that question if I were to put it to you through a long series of exchanges?

Mr. TODD. I will resort to the fifth amendment for anything prior to the beginning of the year 1955.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, did anything happen to you at that time that would cause your answer to change with respect to that last answer?

Mr. TODD. I don't quite understand you, Judge.

Mr. MORRIS. Is there anything that took place in your life, any episode of your life that took place, that would cause you to alter your answer to that question?

Mr. TODD. (No response).

Mr. MORRIS. Tell me this: Was there a regulation of the Federated Press? We have heard from Miss Montgomery that the Tass News Agency had a regulation that people who worked for Tass News Agency are not supposed to be members of the Communist Party.

Now, did Federated Press, whom you represent here in Washington, promulgate any such order to their employees that they, too, should not be members of the Communist Party?



Mr. TODD. No.

Mr. MORRIS. I am asking you, Mr. Todd, if you can tell me—it may well be that the circumstances were such that you cannot come forward with that evidence—is there anything that took place in your life, such as that, such as an order of the Federated Press not to be a Communist, that would cause you to change the answer you have been giving to these questions?

Mr. TODD. I am completely mystified at what the proper answer to your question is because it doesn't hang together.

Mr. MORRIS. All right.

Mr. TODD. I fail to understand it.

Mr. MORRIS. I was wondering—

Mr. TODD. Nothing special happened to me on Christmas morning or—

Mr. MORRIS. Did you resign from the Communist Party?

Mr. TODD. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions.

Chairman EASTLAND. Senator Watkins?

Senator WATKINS. No, I have no questions.

Chairman EASTLAND. You may stand aside.

Mr. TODD. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more witnesses this morning.

Chairman EASTLAND. We will recess now until Thursday at 10:30.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Thursday, March 15, 1956.)

(At a hearing of the subcommittee on April 7, 1956, certain material was ordered into the record at this point. The statement of the acting chairman on that day follows:

Senator WELKER. During December and January, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings during which newspapermen appeared as witnesses. The subcommittee had received evidence that virtually all of these witnesses had been, at some time or other in the past, members of the Communist Party.

Earlier, a Columbia Broadcasting System reporter had made a forthright disclosure before us about his own participation in Communist Party activities, from which association he had been recruited by the Soviet intelligence to work as a correspondent abroad.

From his testimony and from other sources, the subcommittee acquired extensive evidence of Communist penetration of the press. With respect to most of the subsequent witnesses, we noticed that they invoked their privilege under the fifth amendment rather than answer questions about the subcommittee's evidence. Some few admitted what the subcommittee had presented as sworn testimony, but they revealed little more.

Within the area of their testimony of their recent-day or present activity concerning which the subcommittee had no direct sworn testimony, they denied Communist Party membership. However, they gave very little information or evidence to the subcommittee of how Communists in the newspaper field carried on their work.

Just the other day I was reading a book which had just been published, called *Such Is Life*, by Jeanne Perkins Harmon. In chapters 11 and 12, Mrs. Harmon, in a very clear and simple manner, has raised the curtain on some of these very things the subcommittee was seeking to learn. Her narrative deals with her own experience as a newswoman in *Life* magazine in late 1940, and is remarkable analytically. She cites specific instances, the like of which have been withheld from us in sworn testimony.

She has mentioned in these chapters the votes of the individual units of the Newspaper Guild, which Mr. Jay Sourwine, who was then chief counsel of our subcommittee, had put into the record of the subcommittee. The vote mentioned by Mrs. Harmon occurred in 1947 and was on the issue of whether Jack Ryan, whom our evidence clearly indicates was then a Communist, should be

the executive vice president of the Newspaper Guild in New York. The contest was for the control of the Newspaper Guild.

And while it resulted in the first defeat of the Communist-controlled slate in New York, it did show the strength of the totalitarian forces at that time in certain of the units.

Such Is Life relates the heroic work of the anti-Communist writers and newspaper men and women who fought so valiantly to wrest control of the Newspaper Guild from the Communists. The Internal Security Subcommittee has always been mindful of the courage and the determination of those publishers, editors, and newspaper men and women whose devotion to their profession has never flagged.

Mrs. Harmon relates in great detail, among other things, how a story written by her on American flyers protesting the execution of General Mihailovich by Tito was changed and rechanged. She also made this significant observation:

"I do say, however, that there is often as much sin in omission as in commission. A zealous party supporter would be just as roundly congratulated for keeping something out of the public eye as he would be for getting something in. And that, given the high casualty rate on stories, anyway, is comparatively easy to accomplish."

I am offering for the record these chapters by Mrs. Harmon, chapters Nos. 11 and 12 of *Such Is Life*, and I am ordering that they appear in the printed record in the sequence of the testimony of Tass correspondents who are currently appearing before this subcommittee.

(The material referred to above was marked "Exhibit No. 171" and reads as follows:)

#### CHAPTER 11

Of all the memories I have of the years at *Life*, the one that stands out most vividly in my mind is the struggle against communistic infiltrators on newspapers and magazines of New York. Maybe I have become hipped on the subject, where previously I had refused to take the supposed menace of Soviet agents seriously. At any rate, what I saw when I was working in the trade changed my general thinking more radically than anything else and for all time. And because of the profound impact the whole business had on me personally, I feel impelled to describe what happened as I saw it.

On and off I had listened to some of my more politically minded colleagues talking of the growing danger of subversives in the publications field. Writers told of headlines subtly altered to convey meanings never intended; reporters referred to pressures exerted upon them to ignore one story and push another; sincere liberals claimed to have endorsed seemingly innocent drives only to find them plain ordinary party instrumentalities.

However, dealing mainly with etiquette experts, movie personalities, and other noncontroversial subjects, I had not paid much attention to their fears. Because I had never had any firsthand experience with communism or Communists, aside from Noel's and my frustrated attempt to get a story in Hollywood, the party was a dim, shadowy subject which interested me very little, particularly at a time when the Russians were supposed to be such close friends of ours.

As far as the activities of party sympathizers, or fellow travelers, on our magazine were concerned, I felt, first of all, that the danger was much exaggerated generally—my friends were seeing things under the bed; secondly, if there were any such situation, no organization headed by anyone so militantly opposed to communism as Henry Luce would tolerate it.

Then one afternoon my upstairs neighbor, also a magazine writer, phoned to invite me to a cocktail party. "It's for some young flyers who are interested in the Mihailovich trail," she explained. "They're all upset about it, can't get anybody to listen to them. It would make them feel good just to meet somebody from *Life*. Besides, you'll hear the noise in your apartment anyway, so why not come up for a few minutes?"

I thanked her and agreed to make it if I could, having no intention of doing so. All I had heard about Mihailovich was that he had been head of the Yugoslavia underground during the war and had been widely praised for leading guerrilla warfare. That I happened to know solely because Noel had once had the idea of interviewing Mihailovich by short-wave radio telephone from behind the lines, on the theory that the result might be a good piece. The scheme hadn't worked, and what had happened in Yugoslavia since interested me not at all.

When I got home that night, the party was still going on. My neighbor called over the banister to come up, and I did.

In her living room were twenty-odd young men, clean-cut, voluble, and terribly in earnest about their cause. It seemed that during the war they had been rescued by General Mihailovich's forces when shot down by the Germans, and they felt they owed him their lives. Now that his regime had been overthrown by Tito and the Communists and the general was on trial, Soviet style, they wanted to show their appreciation by testifying that he had not been a traitor, at least in their case.

Many of the boys were willing to fly over and testify in person. But Tito refused to admit them to the trial. Next, they requested permission to offer written testimony. That, too, the People's Court disallowed. As at last resort, they were holding a mock trial of their own in New York, with Arthur Garfield Hays of the American Civil Liberties Union presiding.

"We're not setting ourselves up to decide whether he's guilty or not," explained one youngster. "That's not our business. But we do say he deserves a fair trial, with witnesses heard on both sides, as to whether or not he was a Fascist, whether or not he collaborated with the Germans. He sure didn't as far as we were concerned."

After listening to them, a well-known war correspondent and some army intelligence officers who also felt that the general was being railroaded out of Tito's way through trumped-up charges, I became sufficiently interested to want to know a little more about the whole affair. I was not sold either way, nor did I have any great burning crusading urge. It just seemed to me that if the trial was that urgent to those boys, if they felt strongly enough about it to drop their own activities and gather from all over the country, the situation was at least worth understanding.

At the office the next morning I asked one of the girls in charge of clipping the newspapers on every conceivable subject to let me see the stories on the Mihailovich trial.

"Oh, I don't have any," she said. "They didn't tell me to clip that."

This surprised me; any story running more than one day was usually watched by the domestic news department, and the mock trial had been going on for several days. I called the foreign news section, but got no help there either.

"We're not doing anything about Tito and Mihailovich," I was told. "It's not important." This seemed odd indeed.

When my request to the morgue for information turned up the same result, I began to wonder if perhaps the warnings of Communist-fearers might not have some basis. Certainly somewhere there should have been something available on this business.

Mihailovich had received reams of publicity at one time; he had even been a Time cover candidate, as I recalled. The blackout of his troubles with Communist Tito, then a loyal Soviet servant, just might have been inspired by people eager to keep the purge quiet. I consulted Blanche Finn, the company's leading Communist expert. Blanche is a former labor organizer and a dedicated New Deal Democrat, as well as Time's labor researcher.

"What did you expect?" she said. "Naturally you won't find anything against Tito. He's a good Communist, for heaven's sake. Why do you think I keep my own files?"

Apparently Blanche had run into this situation enough to induce her to set up her own independent file system, which she maintained on her own time. But since her interest was mainly domestic, she didn't have anything on Mihailovich either.

After work that night, I dropped by the public library and read the back issues of the papers. At home, I typed up the highlights of the situation in a memo to an editorial writer with the suggestion that it might fit in his department, either as a short editorial on the trial and the rescued flyers' point that guilty or not, a man deserves a fair trial, or as part of a larger discussion the editorial page might be planning on a general subject.

The editorial writer suggested that I do a short text piece on the story, leaving out all editorializing, and making it center on the objective of the boys themselves—to try to get evidence presented for, as well as against, the man on trial.

I batted out 800 words or so on the subject during my lunch hour, took it by the writer's office, and left it with him for his secretary to type. The regular typing room, my Guild friends had warned, was apt to include members of the



same group that considered such things as the trial and what it represented "unimportant." If pro-Communists learned that such a story was in the works, which of course they would if it were processed through regular channels, they might discredit it before the editor ever saw it. Therefore, I didn't mention it to anyone.

In a short time, the managing editor notified me that he had read the story and would run it to close the following afternoon. No changes necessary, he said, except for a little cutting.

Now the manuscript went on the editorial conveyor belt—copy room for counting, space allotment, layout, etc.—and the fat was in the fire. The news spread as fast as the switchboard could make the necessary connections.

In a very short time, I got a call from one of the writers, an attractive, down-to-earth fellow who, though well up in the salary bracket, made much of his ardent union sympathies. One of the stories he liked to tell on himself was the time he walked up some 17 floors or so in protest against scab elevator operators, only to discover that the elevator strike currently in progress did not affect our building or the union members in good standing who were driving the cars.

Bill was an engaging, friendly guy, very popular with workers and management alike. He was also extremely able. On more than one occasion, I had heard him described as "the perfect Life writer," a master of short sentences and simple words, and a whiz at headlines and captions.

Communists generally are pictured as gloomy, mediocre characters who can't make a go of things on their own and therefore embrace the system in hopes either of improving their own lot or dragging everyone down to their same level. That was one of the false impressions I had to correct.

While there are such moth-eaten society rejects in the party, there are also some mighty attractive, mighty successful and prosperous members, too—people who seem to have everything to lose by the ascendancy of communism. Why they are Communists is a question that keeps you awake nights, once you know that they are.

On the occasion of the Mihailovich story, Bill was as warm and friendly as ever. One of his most ingratiating qualities was his "regular guy" personality. Unlike some Ivy League Racquet Club writers, he pulled no rank on those less prosperous than himself. When he was called upon to "fix up" somebody's copy, the ensuing confabs had the aura of two good friends working out a problem, almost a personal problem, instead of the cold business of earning one's salary by stringing the proper words together in the proper order.

Bill was everybody's friend. Never did he say an unkind word about anyone. But every now and then he would begin "worrying" about some staff member.

"Gosh," he would say with concern to a boss, usually when some of the even bigger brass was within hearing, "Sam's been looking mighty seedy lately. Haven't you noticed? I think he's sick. Comes in here at 11 o'clock in the morning, looking like death warmed over. I don't think you oughta ask him to do that coal mine story. I'll do it. Sam's health can't stand it."

Or, "Be a good guy and take Lon off the nightclub beat. I love him, but he's just not up to it \* \* \*

This sort of thing would go on for weeks, until his boss was convinced that the victim wasn't up to the job. The unfortunate staffer would be gracefully transferred to a "less exacting" job, probably next fired for "his own good." With a fat severance pay check, of course. I had seen it happen to three of my best friends, all of whom landed on their feet with good jobs elsewhere. But I refused to believe the anti-Communists' assertions that they had been liquidated because they bucked the party. I knew they did, but couldn't see the connection with their private political activities and their office careers.

The technique was always so sincere, and delivered with just the right flavor of diffidence, that no one but the most outrageous cynic could doubt the purity of the motives. In my case, Bill was deeply concerned—for me, of course.

"This Yugoslavian thing, hon'," he said, munching on a candy bar, feet up on the desk. "I'm worried for you. Do you realize what it can mean?"

I allowed as how I didn't think it meant much of anything, other than what it said.

"I don't mean the story. I don't care about the story. I care about you. Do you know what publishing this piece under your byline can do to you?"

I told him no, I didn't.

Bill shook his head, very concerned. "I was afraid of that Sweetie, if you let this thing get published, you'll be blackballed by every liberal group in the country."

I took some exception to this, on the grounds that as I understood liberalism (and who does?) it meant just what the word did, "liberty." In this case, the fliers should have the "liberty" of presenting their case, be they right or wrong, and the defendant should have the "liberty" of having something said in his favor.

Bill shook his head some more. "Lucky thing I caught this," he said, "Why, you poor kid, if this thing had gone through, you'd never be able to get another line printed. No publication in the country would touch you with a 10-foot pole. You'd be tagged as a Fascist."

At this point, we took our gloves off. I told him I had no burning ambition to write for every publication in the country anyway: that it made no difference to me whether I was blackballed or not; and that furthermore, while his concern for my welfare was touching in the extreme, it was also more than passing strange. In fact, downright fishy.

Being a smooth and practiced operator, Bill handled himself much better, of course. He argued a little more, still for my own good only; then, shaking his head, he said he would simply have to save me from myself, somehow.

When my copy came back from processing, I saw what my friends had been complaining about. Anonymous little changes appeared here and there, all seemingly minor, but all subtly reversing the tone of the story.

When I charged up to the managing editor's office to complain, I ran into more trouble. Some of the researchers and writers had gotten wind of the story and were making a joint protest against its publication. One or two were even talking about resigning, should it appear.

I got mad, they got mad, we began to argue, and the managing editor kicked us all out. "Go away," he said to me. "Go to the movies, to a baseball game, do anything. But I don't want to see you back in this office until 5 o'clock this afternoon."

He meant it, and I went. When I came back, I found layouts and word counts on my desk, indicating that the piece was going to run after all.

Mine wasn't much of an article, there were no repercussions to speak of, and Mikhailovich was executed shortly thereafter. But some of the changes had stayed in, weakening the point of the story. And as a symbol of what could happen, it scared me. From then on, I began to look around a little. And I didn't like what I saw going on in New York's news world.

The next episode was more subtle. One of the reporters I knew was a dedicated Communist, in the classic sense of the word, and made no secret of her convictions. She attended night sessions at a Communist school twice a week and followed the party line faithfully. Shy and retiring, she was one of the most conscientious workers and a real addition to any staff. Not only because she was so reliable and so willing, but also because, being such a thoroughgoing supporter of the party line, she picked out the points at issue before they got into print. They could be argued out while the story was in the works, and fixed; or, if they were allowed to stand, the editors could be secure in the knowledge that vocal Communist protesters would not have any objections that were valid. If she couldn't prove her point, nobody could. It was a perfect dry run.

Yet of all Communists she was the most harmless because she was constitutionally incapable of trickery and underhandedness. Therefore, I suppose, she was the most expendable.

There were increasing rumbles of criticism of one of the highly placed executives on her publication about the question of political leanings. Because the job involving hiring and firing, the anti-Communists were especially anxious to get rid of that particular cog in the machinery. They discussed the problem with various management officials, to no avail. One veteran of 16 years' service in the same outfit had been a Communist herself, briefly, and had met the executive at local party cell meetings. That too, was brushed off as youthful exuberance.

But as the protests increased, evidently the party brass decided to take no chances. The executive was too important a cog in their organization to lose.

In cases where an important party faithful is in danger, I was to learn, it is accepted procedure to "throw a victim out of the droszky." In other words, fire, eliminate, discredit a genuine but less important pro-Communist for the sake of making secure the important one's position.

Such a sacrificial lamb must of necessity be well-known for Communist leanings. Also, it helps for the individual to be of a noncombative nature.

The reporter fitted the requirements on all counts. She had been hired with the approval of the executive and therefore had the necessary association; she

had always held the cause above all else. By suggesting personally that this girl be fired, the executive was in fact saying, "How could I be a pro-Communist and not only allow, but be the one to suggest, firing such a loyal believer?"

Thus had the reporter been selected to be thrown out of the droszky. However, things went a little wrong. In the first place, she was not sold on, or even told of, the idea. Not being a party hack, the cynicism of the plot shocked and surprised her. Furthermore, while timid, she did object to the unfairness of it.

So did many anti-Communist members of the Newspaper Guild. The only ground on which the executive could base the decision to dispose of the reporter in question, after 2 years of unusually faithful service, staying until dawn, doing all the dirty work, never being careless or sloppy in her work, was that "She didn't grow with the job."

This meant, the victim was told, that while she was an excellent worker and one of the most painstaking members of the staff, she had not developed imagination, had not demonstrated ability to interview. What was not mentioned was the fact that, being so obliging, she inherited all the drudgery while the more aggressive reporters got themselves the assignments and the interviews.

However, when given the chance to do leg work, she seemed to satisfy the eminently non-Communist writers who used her. Some of them, in fact, protested to management when they heard about the proposed firing.

But it didn't do any good. She was fired anyway. I haven't kept track of her, but I have often wondered if she retained her Leftist leanings. For it was an ironic situation, that the only people who came to her defense were the anti-Communists. Usually loud and vociferous in their complaints, the party liners remained completely silent on this occasion and stood by without lifting a finger while we tried to save her. Evidently the word had gone through the ranks that the comrade was to be scuttled.

However, perhaps some good did come of it, because the sacrifice play didn't work for the pro-Communist executive. There was a change in management and from then on those who should have done so long before began to scrutinize her activities more closely.

There had been increasing leaks on stories. Gossip columns were jumping the gun, announcing proposed publication beforehand; certain journals ran stories suspiciously close to those already in the works several days before the original one hit the stands. A press agent called casually one day to confirm publication date on an important essay that had been kept under wraps for months.

It was impossible to attribute the blame with certainty. Besides the editors concerned, an office girl might have overheard, or an information source might have talked.

Still, once management began to watch for it, a certain pattern did seem to take shape. One of the prerogatives of the executive's position was to sit in on all story conferences and to know all stories planned in each department before anyone else.

Finally, they seemed to get wise. As we heard it unofficially, a trap was set. A round-up of Communist functionaries in a certain area was scheduled, fool-proof precautions taken that no one know about the story except the department concerned and the executive. But no one let it be known just how closely guarded the secret was.

Sure enough, the story had scarcely reached the printer before the Communist press came out with a rebuttal. Shortly thereafter, the executive "retired." The leaks stopped, but otherwise, the removal really didn't do too much good. The Communist system of infiltration is pretty hard to beat.

When a staff vacancy occurred on a newspaper or magazine, former party liners explained, news was rushed to party headquarters. Not only the fact that there was a vacancy, but detailed instructions were supplied as to what type of applicant was most likely to land the job. The party selected a candidate, told him or her what to say and how to behave; in short, the party gave a complete coaching based on the recommendation of its members on the inside.

As a random example, one of the commonest mistakes female applicants for jobs on Life or Time used to make was to cite previous writing experience or express a burning desire to write. Time, Inc.'s theory basically was that men write, women research, and that a would-be writer, frustrated in her literary ambition, probably wouldn't make a good researcher. A party applicant would be so warned.



Another error was to overemphasize specialized training. By and large, Time, Inc. wants versatile, flexible researchers, people they can switch from one department to another. Experts can be consulted when needed from the outside. As a rule, they're not particularly desirable as permanent staff members. These and many other tricks of the trade could easily be passed on by party sympathizers within the organization, whichever one it might be. So when the party applicant was interviewed, he had it all over the outsiders. He knew exactly what to expect, exactly how to act in order to make the most favorable impression on his prospective employers.

Thus, even if those doing the hiring were completely anti-Communist, the setup had been so thoroughly cased beforehand that they would naturally choose the party liner, simply because he appeared to be best fitted for the job.

All this was pretty depressing, particularly when the various bigwigs concerned seemed to sit back, hands folded, doing nothing whatsoever about the situation. The anti-Communists in the guild weren't even positive that the executive had been fired on the subversive issue. There was good authority that was the reason, but no official source. It would have been a boost to morale to know for sure that, just once, the management had recognized that there was such a thing as a Communist danger. A lot of anti-Communists felt it was up to the top brass, as masters of important media for molding public opinion, to do something. But since they didn't, anti-Communists took on the job.

The best place to do something about the situation seemed to be within the New York chapter of the Newspaper Guild. This was the showcase, the most overt demonstration of party organization; and the Communists used it for frequent harassing movements, threatening strikes, generally causing disruption and commotion. Operating through the union further strengthened their job security and provided a convenient cloak of respectability.

Those of us who had heretofore remained aloof from the fight decided there was only one thing to do—join the union ourselves.

We signed up by the dozens, including many diehards who had sworn they would never have anything to do with organized labor. "If the company wants to fire me, I don't want some union telling them they can't. I'll fight my own battles," was one point of view. "Unions may be all right in the trades, but in creative work it's just plain ridiculous," was another. "If a writer hasn't got it any more, he hasn't got it, that's all." Many felt that they were being very nicely treated regardless of the union, and saw no need for it.

Nevertheless, they joined en masse, much to the annoyance of some of the old faithful party workers. "Trouble with this union, it's getting too many God-damn members," grumbled the sour-faced secretary who took my application.

We began to attend meetings of the New York chapter of the American Newspaper Guild and thus came face to face with the conditions CBS newscaster Winston Burdett described in 1955. We were up against a bunch of pros, and very able ones at that. The regulars outflanked us, outmaneuvered us, and generally made first-class jackasses out of us.

Union participation, we discovered, was not discussion; it was a theatrical performance. While we would raise a tentative hand to ask a question, or mumble from our seats, the opposition strode briskly to the front of the room, grasped the microphone with practiced ease, and spoke ringingly as the veteran public speakers they were. Should we by chance try to participate in a discussion they had organized, they knew the right rule of parliamentary procedure to shut us up.

If we did manage to get the floor, we were hopelessly blocked. All our carefully planned arguments evaporated in a ground sea of chattering and coughs.

One of the hardest lessons we had to learn in dealing with fanatics is the fact that they never speak in terms of logic. Actually, they never argue. They orate. There is no sense thinking up rebuttals in terms of cold facts, because facts have no place in the discussion.

If one of the anti-Communists happened to make what sounded like a telling point, somebody from the other side would jump up instantly to knock it down. Far from disagreeing, he would pretend to be on the same side. "I agree with Brother So-and-So," he would say smoothly. "I think he is absolutely right in saying \* \* \*" and then go on to drive home a theory a hundred and eighty degrees away from the original thought suggested by the innocent amateur.

Why did they bother with us? That, too, we learned—eventually.

There might have been a handful of tried-and-true "followers," in a union of several hundred members. Those opposed numbered slightly more. The overwhelming majority of the members were in the middle, undecided, unaware that this was a well-rehearsed performance. It was these votes that both sides must get. The speakers, therefore, were not really answering each other; they were addressing the great malleable mass. These were the ones to be convinced.

I'm told the same situation exists in many party-minded unions, be they countries or small local cells. All that is needed is a handful of party pros. In fact, the Communist Party generally prefers it that way. By expert training and proper maneuvering, the hard core of professionals can lead the innocent majority to do just about what they want.

## CHAPTER 12

Gradually, we got our sea legs and began to assess the job we had in front of us. The New York Newspaper Guild had fallen captive to the party; and all over the city, non-Communists at Newsweek, the Herald Tribune, World-Telegram, Associated Press, United Press, etc., stirred in protest. But not one major information-disseminating organ in a town which is probably the capital of the news world was 100 percent free of fellow travelers at all times.

A citywide election of officers was in the offing. This was the time for anti-Communist unionists from all the newspapers and magazines to get together to try and unseat the pro-Communists.

This was a tough proposition, not only because our opponents were so solidly entrenched but because they were also extremely persuasive and attractive in their appearances before the unaffiliated mass membership which would decide the issue.

For one thing, they were completely dedicated. One of them, it was rumored fairly reliably, had turned down a \$50,000-a-year job with private enterprise to continue his work in the guild. Privately, he made no bones of his Communist sympathies. But when challenged publicly as to whether he was or was not a Communist, he followed the instructions of the party: he ducked and cried persecution, or, if a showdown were forced, refused to reply. When asked the same questions in last year's hearings, former guild boss Jack Ryan pleaded the fifth amendment and described himself as a self-employed "horticultural worker."

As the campaign intensified, so did the tricks. Those already in the saddle had the valuable privilege of making up the agenda in advance. Thus, they could clog up the early hours of the meetings with trivia, saving the crucial issues until late at night. Their followers were warned ahead of time, but on the first few occasions, the anti-Communists were soundly trounced by this device. Commuters had to make trains, other anti-Communists had important previous engagements.

Not so the professionals. They scored their big victories when the air became thick with smoke, the members befogged and weary from too much beer from the union bar and too many hours of sitting on intentionally uncomfortable folding chairs. Grimly, we learned to stick it out.

As we began to make gains, hostilities increased. "Sexually frustrated, that's what you are—the bunch of you," thundered an uncommonly unattractive battle-axe comrade from Brooklyn. Conversation became increasingly perfunctory; virtually all semblance of union solidarity disappeared.

The tactics became more crude. On one issue requiring written votes, the Communists won by exactly the number of votes contained in one of the few units that habitually voted almost 100 percent against them. When one of the members of that unit asked to see the tally on her organization, she was told that her unit had not turned in any votes. When she countered with the fact that she herself had delivered them personally to the guild officer in charge, she was told they must have been "lost." She demanded, and got, another count, and from then on, there were watchers at the polls and in the counting rooms. What had happened, evidently, was that the Communists had opened the votes ahead of time, noted that that one unit was the decisive factor, and therefore "removed" it from the election.

In the office, meanwhile, our work was suffering. Our opponents had a regular system. While the important ones devoted at least half their working day to union business, less vital sympathizers did their regular work for them. Lacking the manpower for such coverage, we earned a good many raised eyebrows from our bosses over closed-door caucuses; lengthy telephone conversations;

# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE  
UNITED STATES

---

MARCH 15, 1956

---

**PART 10**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1956



Boston Public Library  
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 26 1956

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

PRICE DANIEL, Texas

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

HERMAN WELKER, Idaho

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

---

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri

PRICE DANIEL, Texas

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

HERMAN WELKER, Idaho

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*

WILLIAM A. RUSHER, *Administrative Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

and even, on occasion, use of office materials for campaign literature. It was the difference of who put what things first. To some people, the cause always comes first. To us, unfortunately, holding on to our jobs had to be our primary consideration. This put us at a bad disadvantage.

No wonder they beat us at every turn in our own arena of combat, the union meetings. We were up against a gang of experts. The only solution was to try and learn the business ourselves.

We were fortunate in having among our ranks several experienced members. Earl Brown, the Negro reporter from Life, and Blanche Finn have always been particular thorns in the Communist side, not only because they knew the score from years of experience, but also because they are above reproach on their records as liberals and labor supporters. A smear campaign on the basis of antiracialism or religion was out, too, in their case. Besides Earl and Blanche, there were also in the guild some ex-labor organizers and one former Communist who had graduated from the "trade school" in his early days. Under their tutelage, we began a regular program of instruction.

Once a week we gathered in one another's houses while the veterans taught us the fine points of parliamentary procedure, how to address a meeting, how to use a microphone. Sometimes we met in musty Greenwich Village lofts; other nights the settings were chic East Side apartments or elegant New York townhouses. Whether we sat on the floor or on a penthouse terrace, the routine was the same. Gradually, we improved.

We learned to toss about such phrases as "broaden the base of participation," meaning, let's all decide on this instead of a bunch of operators taking action in caucus; or "Democratize the procedure," for blocking a railroading. We learned, too, the value of "point of information, Mr. Chairman, please," and "point of personal privilege," when in doubt. (Senator McCarthy had not as yet made these household words.) Perhaps most important of all, we learned to use our emotions, rather than succumb to them. Never get angry, but sometimes it is effective to pretend to be angry. Never snap back until you have had a chance to think over your remark at least once. When you object, make it seem an amendment rather than an objection.

As our performance began to show beginnings of promise, the opposition paid us the compliment of assigning specific teammates to cope with each of us. If I rose to speak, I could be certain that one reporter, and nobody else, would jump up to "agree" with me. It was soon such generally recognized procedure that no one was particularly shocked when one earnest little blonde anti-Communist said in meeting one night, "I resent being answered by just anybody. Mary gets to be answered by somebody important, so does Natalie. What's the matter with me?"

Although this remark was greeted with some laughter, nevertheless, we had improved.

At last came December 18, the big election night. All of us went to union headquarters and stayed there until the following morning. As we watched the count, we dared to hope. One unit after another—The American Weekly, the Herald Tribune—came in, giving the anti-Communist ticket the edge. About dawn, we were sure of victory. It had been a really tough battle. Toward the end, Communist braintrusts had enlisted outside speakers; ours were booed down, and we were denied admission to some of the rallies. But to no avail. We had won at Time, Inc. by four votes.

The morning papers reported the results; we appeared at work baggy-eyed but jubilant. Our candidates relieved the old guard down at union headquarters. From that day to this, so far as I know, the leadership itself of the New York Guild has been anti-Communist.

It is interesting to note how the voting went on the various publications that night. In the case of the then executive vice president, now self-employed horticultural worker, John Ryan, for instance:

## FOR RYAN

## AGAINST

Amsterdam News-----	26 to 13	Acme News Service-----	82 to 3
Billboard-----	12 to 9	American Weekly-----	53 to 13
Hungarian Journal-----	12 to 0	Associated Press-----	110 to 104
In Fact-----	10 to 0	Bronx Home News-----	126 to 20
Jewish Day-----	27 to 1	Commonweal-----	6 to 0
Jewish Journal-----	52 to 4	Herald Tribune-----	290 to 84
Labor Press-----	73 to 14	International News Photos--	30 to 25
Look magazine-----	20 to 11	International News Service..	15 to 6
Mirror-----	174 to 108	Jewish Forward-----	26 to 0
Nation-----	7 to 6	Journal-American-----	399 to 63
New Masses-----	16 to 0	Daily News-----	494 to 167
Newsweek-----	112 to 32	Post-----	154 to 84
New York Times-----	510 to 260	Scholastic-----	20 to 4
Daily Worker-----	63 to 0	Staats Herold-----	15 to 11
World-Telegram-----	133 to 129	Tide-----	5 to 4
		Time, Inc.-----	183 to 179
		United Press-----	60 to 28

Did the new order stop our pro-Communist colleagues? Not at all. The very next year we got a sample of their tenaciousness in the presidential election. The CIO, of which the Newspaper Guild is a part, of course, voted to endorse Truman. Naturally, many individual guild members would vote as they pleased. But the guild itself, as a loyal unit of the parent union, officially, should follow the decision of the CIO, parent organization.

Yet before our astonished eyes, we saw some of our union veterans urging us to bolt the CIO and endorse Wallace. Undoubtedly many innocent people may have voted for Wallace. But for journalists, people working constantly with facts and news, it was almost too much to believe that all of them were that naive, even putting aside the consideration of union loyalty which was usually held so sacred.

One of the pro-Communists' most effective and frequently used weapons was to accuse anyone who differed with them of not being union-minded, not putting the union and solidarity above all other considerations. Yet when it suited their own purpose, as in this case, they would blandly turn around and commit the most outrageous kind of labor treason.

And the terrifying thing was that they seemed to get away with it as far as the mass of the membership was concerned. Our people protested, pointing out that we should not, as a member chapter, officially go on record as refusing to comply with our parent organization, the CIO. When it became obvious that we were outnumbered, we suggested as a compromise that we pass no resolution at all. But logic had nothing to do with the issue.

Shortly thereafter I had to cover a Progressive Party rally at Madison Square Garden. When I went to get the press passes, they had all disappeared. The Life photographer and I lined up with the rest of the general public at the ticket office outside to buy our seats while Paul Robeson's spirituals were piped out onto the street.

If there had been any doubt then in my mind of the terror of what might come to pass in America, it disappeared that night. Theatrically, the staging was a masterpiece. Robeson's velvet-voiced serenading was simple and moving against a quiet piano accompaniment. The arena itself was dark, except for dramatic spotlights strategically placed to give the most impressive effect. Wallace and Taylor, handsome men both, looked bigger than life, in a setting arranged to present them as 20th-century saviors.

The talk was pure demagoguery, hypnotism of the most dreadful form. The photographer and I could see it catch hold as we looked at the faces around us, almost trance-like in their absorption. Each remark was greeted with roars of applause. And, as at our union meetings, the majority were, I was convinced, plain ordinary citizens, neither Communists nor anti-Communists. As we sat there, not applauding, my neighbor, a motherly looking suburbanite, kept looking at me. Finally she spoke. "How can you sit there and not clap?" she said. "They're so handsome."

In various blocks throughout the Garden certain racial groups sat together as units. The theme that night was fear. One minority group after another was appealed to on the grounds of fear, warned that this was their last chance at freedom and survival. What they had escaped in the old country was nothing, they were told, compared to the horrors that awaited them in America unless they supported the third party.



As the eloquent voices, emphasized with mood music and lights, droned through powerful amplifiers, about the slavery in sight, the dire consequences of either Democratic or Republican victory, the mass impact was enough to terrify anybody, much less the frightened, shaken foreigners or relatives of foreigners in the audience. Greeks, Negroes, Jews. Each group got its summons to contribute, support the cause, or expect the worst. One by one, they sidled up, white-faced, to present their offerings. It was like a voodoo mass.

I wish every citizen in the United States could have had a dose of the poison that was being disseminated that night. It was so infinitely cruel, so utterly disgusting, you had the feeling of unreality that "it can't be happening here—not in America." And yet it was. A mass massacre of souls. I felt like jumping up and telling these people, "It's not true. None of it. Read the inscription on the Statue of Liberty. Look at your history books. America will never do things like this."

In the end, the rally degenerated to a riot; it was a horrible spectacle. And who had the press seats while we tried to get pictures from some 50 rows back and to the side? In the very front row, the choice location reserved for reporters and honored guests, sat a typist, a copy girl, and a couple of other guild stalwarts—applauding like mad.

To my mind, the struggle will remain so long as the same individuals who supported the party influence in the guild keep their jobs handling the news. And the repercussions can be unfortunate. I may have come to seeing things under the bed myself; I will admit that the whole experience gave me a good scare.

Take just this one case, for instance. The man who had told me the Mihailovich episode was not important was also one of the biggest of the Progressive Party boosters. There was no proof that he was a Communist as far as party card or other documentary evidence was concerned. The party is very careful about that, particularly with important people. Indeed, some of the really important Communists themselves do not have a party card and never have had, and they are kept completely aloof from party machinery.

Still, in the case of this young man, there were certainly enough indications to cause at least reasonable doubt. He was all for peace until Russia got into World War II, then he immediately joined the howling for a second front. He denounced the Marshall plan as a capitalistic trap and in addition to his Wallace work, took the positions on other key issues that experts have come to consider sufficient basis for investigation.

Shortly after Wallace's defeat, the young man departed to take on a post in one of the United States Government's information bureaus abroad. This upset some of us enough to write the FBI, urging that his reliability be double-checked. Mr. Hoover acknowledged the letter, but the applicant got the job anyway. As Mr. Hoover pointed out to us, he had no power to act, only to report.

A couple of years after I had left New York, an FBI investigator came to see me in the Virgin Islands, where I live, to inquire more fully into the matter of evidence, which I took to mean they weren't evidently satisfied themselves. It seemed that the young man had not only held his job, but was now being promoted to an even greater position of trust, heading a strategic bureau abroad. I can't help but wonder how he feels about unification of Germany, for example.

How do these things happen? How did such a situation come into our particular company? Henry Robinson Luce has been called many things, but not even his bitterest enemies could include Communist among them without being ridiculed out of print.

Luce has been labeled "Fascist" "power-hungry," "intolerant." Yet the fact that he is the very opposite of these things explains, I believe, why he allowed the small but disturbing element to exist.

Why? How can this be?

The answer goes back to the 1930's.

When Heywood Brown came into Time, Inc., to organize the original chapter of the Newspaper Guild, one of the first and most enthusiastic would-be members was Henry Luce himself. According to employes who were there then, he was genuinely disappointed when told that, being the boss, he could not join.

My own encounters with Mr. Luce have been limited to a small dinner party at the home of one of the editors; an hour or so's conversation over a cup of coffee at Holland House with him and one of our correspondents; and the usual snatches of small talk at company functions, office parties, and one or two of the Wednesday editors' lunches held in the Time, Inc. private dining room in Radio City.

Henry Luce is someone you would remember meeting, however briefly, because he doesn't fit any particular pattern of anyone you have ever met before. His red-gray brows beetle just as much as the cartoons indicate; his blue eyes are as steely as described; and with his gruff manner wiry, restless physique, and hard-to-understand bark of a voice, he seems somewhat of a cold fish.

On the other hand, he has a sharp, all-consuming curiosity and interest in any subject under discussion. It is almost as though he wanted to eat up, swallow, and digest that particular item all in one gulp. He seems to be saying "give us the dope, all the dope, and be pretty quick about it." Although he stammers on occasion, usually his conversation is so clipped and abrupt that this speech defect isn't noticeable.

Perhaps it is the height of presumptiveness to try to evaluate anyone as complex as Henry Luce on the basis of a few chance meetings and an occasional ride in the elevator with him. On the other hand, so many pundits have seen fit to interpret, analyze, and explain his character and motivations on the basis of no personal contact whatsoever, I might as well air my views, too—everybody else does.

At any rate, in my inexperienced opinion, the unhappy situation that prevailed at Time, Inc., in regard to the guild problem had its roots in the very nature of Henry Luce as a man.

His biographers have pointed out that he was raised the son of a Protestant missionary in China. What they fail to mention is that he evidently still holds a sincere religious feeling. This would explain a sense of obligation to tolerate and understand his fellow man, regardless of whether or not he happens to agree with him.

Throughout prep school and college, Luce dedicated 1 hour a day to good works. He still does good works, on a scale expanded more than proportionately to his enlarged capacity, though he does not ballyhoo his philanthropies, endowments, or research funds. Every once in a while, in a library or a reference file, I used to come across a study, a scholarship, or a fund listed as financed by Time, Inc. But this fact was never headlined by Time, Inc.

In addition to his religious motivation, I have another theory as to why Luce is so hipped on every individual's right to do and think as he pleases. That is his experiences as a white child, a different child, set down alone in a completely alien, often hostile, environment. He looked unlike his slant-eyed Chinese playmates. They talked different languages, lived differently, worshiped different gods.

Children are known for their delight in tormenting anyone who is in any way different. So perhaps as a child Henry Luce made up his mind that anyone he ever had anything to do with would be allowed to differ as much as he pleased.

This allergy to imposing authority is admirable so long as it confines itself to the employees' private lives. It is fine that Mr. Luce knows and accepts the fact that probably most of his writers and researchers are working ardently for the Democratic Party while he and his magazines go all out for the Republicans. It is equally Mr. Luce's business if he wants to let union workers use up large quantities of the time he is paying for in doing union work during office hours—so long as it is really union work. And although he lives himself by a basically strict code of ethics, Mr. Luce has never allowed any interference in the sometimes rather sticky domestic situations that have developed within his staff. But on occasion, I think he carries this highly praiseworthy hands-off policy too far, as have many of the other publications.

It is one thing to allow each individual the right to his own opinion, but it is quite another to put him in a position to express it in America's most powerful media for molding public opinion. I'm not saying that Time and Life or the New York Times or any other news organ are Communist propaganda organs; obviously, that would be absurd. I do say, however, that there is often as much sin in omission as in commission. A zealous party supporter would be just as roundly congratulated for keeping something out of the public eye as he would for getting something in. And that, given the high casualty rate on stories anyway, is comparatively easy to accomplish.

Finally, it was not quite fair to the rest of the employees in those no-holds-barred days to have to struggle not only against the pro-Communist network thoroughly entrenched within the guild, but also against their supporters who were in a position to hire and fire. One little stenographer very nearly lost her job the morning after a guild election in which she had caught a crucial discrepancy in the vote count. In addition to all this, we non-Communists had no substitutes to do our work, nobody to cover up for us, as did the others.

We felt that management forces were ducking a responsibility in not doing a little housecleaning of their own, instead of leaving us to fight it out on our own against a stacked deck in the guild.

To us *Time*, Inc.-ers, the struggle for control of the union was the most serious, the hardest fought clash of the time. Far better known, of course, was the Whittaker Chambers crisis, which was unfolding simultaneously. Yet those of us who were supposedly on the inside then knew little more about it other than what we read in the papers.

Time writers are not only anonymous in the matter of bylines, but also generally by temperament. Whittaker Chambers was even more of a recluse than most. A small, round, shabbily dressed little man with deep blue eyes, thinning white hair, bad teeth, and an ever-present pipe, he had a passion for privacy, possibly because of the fact that he lived daily in mortal fear of his life and that of his family. His address was a carefully guarded secret, so was his home telephone, usually unavailable from the telephone operators on request. Anyone trying to reach Whit by telephone through the office switchboard was given his mother's telephone number. She in turn had Whit call back.

I happened to meet him when he was writing a *Life* article; I was at the time in charge of layouts for such articles. Usually the researcher assigned to work with me in gathering pictures did most of the work; I came into it in the later stages, picking out what seemed best suited for actual publication and working with the layout boys on making up the final form. But both the researcher and I spent more time on that one story by Chambers than we usually gave to any normal half-dozen.

Whether it was because of his murky background, or because of a natural personality trait of his own, Whit was an absolute fanatic in his insistence upon verifying everything down to the most minute detail. As some people have an obsession about cleanliness and carry it to extremes, others have manias about germs, so was Whit about accuracy. He took our word for nothing. Dates, places, names of artists, each and every tiny factor he refused to accept until he had seen it proved with his own eyes. The researcher's theory was because he had lived with lies for so many years, truth had become a sacred cause with him.

Normally, collecting pictures and making layouts for a piece brings no more than passing contact with the author. He is responsible for the words; the pictures are our problem. In this case, however, we spent so much time with Whit that we almost felt as though he was an old friend. And we got to like him. Relaxed, quiet, endowed with an unobtrusive but good sense of humor, he gave no indication of the tremendous inner torment he was going through. Indeed, he was much less high strung and temperamental than the usual writer.

When the bombshell finally burst in full force, we were more surprised than people who hadn't known him. Chambers could so easily have held on to his big job, kept on building the farm that he loved so deeply, and lived in peace with his wife and children for the rest of his days. All he had to do was keep his mouth shut.

Up until he joined *Time*, his had been a turbulent and uncertain life—poverty, privation, mental confusion. When at least he apparently had achieved security, stability, spiritual serenity, it seemed odd that he should give all that up.

When I hear people who have never known either him or Alger Hiss pontificating on what a stinker Chambers is, I do wonder if they have read factual accounts of the case, or taken the trouble to look into the testimony. Because Chambers certainly didn't gain anything out of the whole sorry mess. His job was gone, his health broken, and his reputation will forever be suspect.

Probably I am prejudiced because I did like him when I worked with him. But I saw a brilliant writing talent and a restless, searching mind hidden behind a gentle old-fashioned courtesy through which came flashes of a rare sense of humor.

On December 10, 1948, the publisher of *Time* sent each of us a copy of Whittaker Chambers' letter of resignation:

"I hereby tender and ask that you accept my resignation as a senior editor of *Time* magazine. Both of these acts became imperative when I recently began to make revelations about Communist espionage. When *Time* hired me in 1939, its editors knew that I was an ex-Communist; they did not know that espionage was involved.

"For 9 years I have been actively fighting communism. I believe I was helpful in alerting *Time*'s editors years ago to the dangers of worldwide communism which have been confirmed by events and which are now generally, if imperfectly, understood in this country. In my own writing I have tried to give expression to



human values which I knew from my own experience communism denies and destroys. Now, after 9 years of work done in good conscience, I have been called upon to expose the darkest and most dangerous side of communism—espionage. This can be done only if a man who knows the facts will stand up and tell them without regard to the cost or consequences to himself. I cannot share this indispensable ordeal with anyone. Therefore, with a quiet and firm mind, I am withdrawing from among the colleagues with whom I worked for so many years and whose support has been loyal and generous."

Appended to the resignation was the company's comment. To my mind, it illustrates perhaps more vividly than anything else could, Henry Luce's basic philosophy of tolerance. In the case of what I considered to be pro-Communists, I resented, and still resent, this tolerance. In Chambers' case, the other side of the coin is an insistence on fair play and withholding of censure until the accused has had every opportunity of vindication:

"Time has accepted Mr. Chamber's [in the excitement, somebody failed to check spelling] resignation for the reasons which he has so well expressed.

"In accepting his resignation now, Time does not wish to prejudice and is not prejudging his recent disclosures. Not until all the evidence is in can the pros and cons be weighed. Against the admitted disservice to his country of a decade ago must be set the service we are convinced he is trying to perform for his country now."

So far as Time, Inc., was concerned, that ended the Chambers episode. Basically, the big threat of communism seems to have about subsided, too. Every now and then, someone looking for it might be able to find a little party work sneaking in here and there on the various magazines and newspapers, but nothing like it was before the Battle of the Newspaper Guild.

The anti-Communists are still on the watch, and it may not be too much to hope that, at long last, management echelons may have learned a bit of a lesson themselves. Probably the most potent factor of all is that the mass membership of the guild is not as gullible as it used to be. At any rate, the opportunities for infiltration have perceptibly diminished.

But the battle will never be completely over. The same "liberals" stay on and on in the guild and, though more careful these days, still seem to be pretty effective under the new euphoniously called anti-anti-communism. This, as I get it, means fighting the people who fight communism. The double negative sounds so much better than "pro-Communist."

In July 1955, the American Newspaper Guild in convention unanimously voted not to defend the employment rights of any member who is "an admitted or proved Communist Party member." As one guild member from St. Louis put it, "If anyone wants to exercise his right to be part of a conspiracy, then let him seek employment from those who agree with him."

To which, a fervent amen.

On May 9, 1956, at a public hearing at which Senator Arthur V. Watkins presided, additional matter was ordered into the record at this point.

The testimony follows:

Mr. MORRIS. A witness before this subcommittee, Franklin Folsom, in connection with the Tass hearings, refused to say, unlike all the other witnesses who appeared in the Tass hearings, whether in fact he had worked for the Tass News Agency. He refused to say on the grounds that his answers might incriminate him.

I would like to offer for the record the September 3, 1947, registration filed by Tass, pursuant to section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, in which it is listed that Franklin Folsom, 142 East 27th Street, New York City, was in fact an employee of Tass at that particular time.

May that go into the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WATKINS. This is a photostatic copy of the original document?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. That is a photostat of the original registration certificate, which shows in fact that Folsom was employed by

Tass at that time, at the time he refused to say that he was, pleading fifth amendment privilege.

Senator WATKINS. It will be made a part of the record.

Mr. MORRIS. I have here two photostats that may be of interest to the committee, because they contain additional facts, similar registration for March 31 and September 30, 1948, also containing the name of Franklin Folsom. To some extent, they are duplicates, but since it is a different registration, there is a little more information on it, putting more information in the files.

Senator WATKINS. These are photostatic copies of the official record?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. They may be made a part of the record.

(The exhibits referred to were marked "No. 172, 172-A, and 172-B." Exhibit No. 172 is printed in full below, followed by the first three pages of Exhibits Nos. 172-A and 172-B, complete copies of which may be found in the subcommittee files:)

#### EXHIBIT NO. 172

[Stamped: Filed October 28, 1947, Foreign Agents Registration Section, Department of Justice]

#### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION STATEMENT

*Pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended*

REGISTRATION NO. 464

For Six Months Period Ending September 30, 1947

1. (a) Name of Registrant.

New York Bureau of the Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R. (TASS).

(b) All other names used by Registrant during the period.

None.

(c) Address of principal office.

50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

(d) Name of person or persons in charge of principal office.

Alexander Georgievich Alexandrov.

3. If Registrant is a nonbusiness membership organization, state—

Inapplicable.

(a) Approximate number of members in the United States \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Approximate number of members outside the United States \_\_\_\_\_

Inapplicable.

4. (a) All persons who became partners, officers, directors, and similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection began:

Position, office, or nature of duties:

None.

(b) All persons who ceased to be partners, officers, directors, or similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection ended:

Reason for ending connection:

None.

5. (a) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which began to operate during the period.

Name and address of branch, unit, group, or organization:

None.

Nature of connection with Registrant:

None.

Name and address of person in charge:

None.

(b) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which ceased to operate during the period.

Name of branch, unit, group, or organization:

Reason operations ceased:

None.

6. All persons who at any time during the period were foreign principals of Registrant.

Name and principal address:

Is person still a foreign principal of Registrant?

If not, give date connection ended:

None.

7. Describe fully all activities of Registrant during the period for or in the interests of each foreign principal named under item 6.

Gathering and transmitting American news to the U. S. S. R.

8. Describe briefly all other businesses, occupations, and public activities in which Registrant engaged during the period.

None.

9. Furnish the following information as to all employees and other individuals, except those named under item 4, who during the period rendered any services or assistance to Registrant, with or without compensation, for or in the interests of any foreign principal named under item 6:

(a) All such employees and other individuals for whom Exhibits A have previously been filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of any changes during period in activities for Registrant or its foreign principals	Has connection with registrant ended?
Kenneth Durant, Jamaica, Vt.....	.....	No.
Esther Shields, 9 West 97th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Harry Freeman, 22 East 89th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Thurber Lewis, 328 West 47th St., New York City.....	.....	Died Aug. 18, 1948.
Timofei Remizov, 121 Madison Ave., New York City.....	.....	No.
Samuel Kraisur, Dahlonga Rd., Mohican Hills, Md., Washington, D. C.....	.....	No.
Emilio Delgado Rodriguez, 29 West 97th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
William Cunningham, 328 West 21st St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Harry Ross, 369 Bleecker St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Jean Montgomery, Marlyn Apartments, Washington, D. C.....	.....	No.
Paul Burns, 294 West 11th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Sasha Small Lurie, 345 Bleecker St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Jerome Klein, 47 Morton St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Franklin Folsom, 142 East 27th St., New York City.....	.....	Yes; left Oct. 1, 1948.
Frederick Van Wicklen, 259 West 11th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Hays Jones, 270 Fort Washington Ave., New York City.....	.....	No.
Laurence Todd, 4805 Langdrum Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.....	.....	No.
Travis K. Hedrick, 3014 South Columbus St., Arlington, Va.....	.....	Yes; left Sept. 1, 1948.
Kuzma Hyashenko, 113 West 103d St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Arcadi Ogorodnikov, 45 West 95th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Michael Fedorov, 614 West 113th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Nikolai Nikolaevich Karev, 56 W. 105th St.....	.....	No.



(b) All such employees and other individuals for whom exhibits A have not been previously filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of services or assistance rendered	Has connection with registrant ended:
Vera Groden, 101 West 60th St. ....	Bookkeeper.....	No.
Vincent Vaccaro, 254A Grand Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. ....	Teletypist.....	No.
Harry Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City.....	do.....	No.
Ruth Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City.....	Librarian.....	No.
Minnie Bunin, 101 West 60th St., New York City.....	Teletypist.....	No.
Julie De Witt, 2 Horatio St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	No.
Jessie Harris, 45 Hawthorne St., Brooklyn.....	Editorial assistant.....	No.
Alison Burroughs, 114 East 123d St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	No.
Evelyn Gross, 308 East 72d St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	Yes; left Apr. 15, 1948.
Rose Averett, 4121 49th St., Long Island City.....	Switchboard operator.....	No.
Fred Nield, 429 East 65th St., New York City.....	Teletypist.....	No.
Corinne Lautman, 511 Roxboro Pl., Washington, D. C. ....	do.....	No.
Micky Virden, 1328 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C. ....	do.....	No.

Filing of Exhibit A for all of the above names, waived because they are clerical and nondiscretionary employees who are not engaged in writing, speaking, organization, or other public or political activities on behalf of Tass or otherwise.

10. Furnish the following information as to Registrant's receipts and expenditures during the period covered by this statement. The information may, if Registrant desires, be furnished for Registrant's latest semiannual fiscal period, provided the period covered is indicated and future statements are furnished on the same basis:

(a) All amounts received during the period directly or indirectly from each foreign principal named under item 6, itemized as follows:

Date funds received	Name of foreign principal from whom funds received <sup>2</sup>	Purposes for which received <sup>3</sup>	Amount received <sup>4</sup>
Apr. 29, 1947	Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., Moscow.	All operational expenditures.....	\$20,000.00
May 22, 1947			23,094.34
June 16, 1947			10,000.00
June 17, 1947			28,301.00
July 28, 1947			35,339.62
Aug. 7, 1947			26,867.92

(b) All amounts received during the period from other sources to be used directly or indirectly for or in the interests of any foreign principal named under item 6, itemized as follows: <sup>1</sup>

Date funds received:

Name of person from whom received: <sup>2</sup>

Purposes for which received: <sup>3</sup>

Amount received: <sup>4</sup>

None.

See footnotes on p. 454.

(c) All expenditures made during the period directly or indirectly for or in the interests of each foreign principal named under item 6, itemized as follows: <sup>5</sup>

Date payment was made	Name of person to whom payment was made <sup>2</sup>	Purposes for which payment was made <sup>3</sup>	Amount of payment <sup>4</sup>
Apr. 1, through Sept. 30, 1947..	-----  Western Union, American Cable & Radio Corp., RCA Communications, Associated Press, United Press, Press Association, New York Telephone Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.	Salaries..... Rent and maintenance, subscriptions, books, supplies, equipment, and other office expenses. Cable tolls and purchase of news services.	\$71,537.04 16,889.62  55,718.50

<sup>1</sup> Include all amounts so received, whether as compensation, loans, contributions, subscriptions, fees, dues, subsidies, or otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> Receipts from or payments to a person amounting to less than \$200 for the period may be combined with other like amounts, provided the source or disposition of the funds, as the case may be, is clearly indicated.

<sup>3</sup> Where funds were received or paid, as the case may be, for various purposes, such purposes shall be listed in reasonable detail.

<sup>4</sup> Show separately the amount received or paid, as the case may be, for each purpose listed under the preceding column.

<sup>5</sup> Include all transfers of funds to any foreign principal.

11. (a) Speeches, lectures, talks, and radio broadcasts arranged or sponsored by Registrant or delivered by officials or employees of Registrant, during the period.

Name of person by whom delivered:

Number of speeches, lectures, and talks delivered:

Number of radio broadcasts delivered:

Inapplicable.

(b) Publications prepared or distributed by Registrant, or by others for Registrant, or in the preparation or distribution of which Registrant rendered any services or assistance, during the period. (Indicate each type of publication by an "X".)

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| (1) Press releases.....  | (12) Radio programs.....     |
| (2) News bulletins.....  | (13) Radio scripts.....      |
| (3) Newspapers.....  | (14) Moving pictures.....    |
| (4) Articles.....  | (15) Lantern slides.....     |
| (5) Books.....   | (16) Still pictures.....     |
| (6) Magazines.....   | (17) Posters.....            |
| (7) Pamphlets.....   | (18) Photographs.....        |
| (8) Circulars.....   | (19) Charts.....             |
| (9) Form letters.....  | (20) Maps.....               |
| (10) Reprints.....   | (21) Other publications..... |
| (11) Copies of speeches, lectures, talks, or radio broadcasts..... |                              |

Inapplicable.

(c) Preparation and distribution of publications referred to in answer to (b) above.

Description of publication:

By whom written, edited, or prepared:

By whom printed, produced, or published:

By whom distributed:

Inapplicable.

(d) Compliance with the filing, labeling, and reporting provisions of Section 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and Rule 400 thereunder.

(1) Were copies or summaries of all communications and publications referred to in answer to (a) and (b) above filed with the Department of Justice and the Librarian of Congress? If not, explain why copies or summaries of any such communications and publications were not filed.

Inapplicable.

(2) Were all such communications and publications labeled in accordance with Section 4 and Rule 400? If not, explain why any such communications and publications were not so labeled.

Inapplicable.

(3) Were reports of the delivery, distribution, or other dissemination of all such communications and publications made to the Department of Justice in accordance with Section 4 and Rule 400? If not, explain why any such reports were omitted.

Inapplicable.

12. (a) Any changes during the period, not fully described above, in Registrant's affiliations, associations, or other connections with foreign governments, foreign political parties, or officials or agencies thereof.

Name of government, party, or official or agency thereof:

Nature of changes during period in Registrant's connections therewith:

None.

(b) Any changes during the period in Registrant's pecuniary interest in or control over partnerships, corporations, associations, or other organizations or combinations of individuals.

Name of organization or combination:

Nature of changes during period in Registrant's ownership or other pecuniary interest:

Nature of changes during period in any direction or control exercised by Registrant:

None.

13. (a) Any changes during the period in the ownership of or supervision, direction or control over Registrant by any organization, group, or individual.

Name of organization group, or individual:

Nature of changes during period in ownership, supervision, direction, or control:

None.

(b) Any subsidy or other financial assistance received by Registrant during the period directly or indirectly from—

Any individual who is is citizen of, or resides in, a foreign country.

Any organization created in, or under the laws of, any foreign country or having its principal place of business in a foreign country.

Any foreign government or foreign political party, or any official or agency thereof.

Name of person from whom subsidy or financial assistance received:

Nature and amount of subsidy or financial assistance:

None. See Item 10a.

14. File the following exhibits with this statement:

*Exhibit A.*—File an Exhibit A, on the printed form provided therefor, for each of the following persons for whom an Exhibit A has not previously been filed:

(a) All partners, officers, directors, and similar officials of Registrant.

Furnished.

(b) All employees or other individuals who during the period rendered any services or assistance to Registrant, with or without compensation, for or in the interests of any foreign principal named under item 6.

See item 9b.

*Exhibit B.*—File a copy of any changes during the period in the agreement, arrangement, or authorization (or if not in writing a written description thereof) pursuant to which Registrant is acting for, or receiving funds from, each foreign principal named under item 6.

Inapplicable.

*Exhibit C.*—File an Exhibit C, on the printed form provided therefor, for each foreign principal named under item 6 for whom an Exhibit C has not previously been filed.

Furnished.



*Exhibit D.*—If Registrant is a nonbusiness organization, file a copy of any changes during the period in its charter, constitution, bylaws, or other instruments of organization.

Inapplicable.

*Exhibit E.*—File a copy of the agreement or arrangement (or if not in writing, a written description thereof) between the Registrant and each business firm or other organization named under item 11 (c), and copies of all changes during the period in similar contracts previously filed.

Inapplicable.

The undersigned swear(s) or affirm(s) that he has (they have) read the information set forth in this statement and the attached exhibits that he is (they are) familiar with the contents thereof and that such contents are in their entirety true and accurate to the best of his (their) knowledge and belief, except that the undersigned makes(s) no representation as to the truth of accuracy of the information contained in Exhibit A insofar as such information is not within his (their) personal knowledge.

/S/ ALEXANDER ALEXANDROV.

Subscribed and sworn to before me at New York, New York, this 20th day of October 1947.

GEORGE J. NEJEDLY,  
*Notary Public in the State of New York.*

My commission expires March 30, 1948.

#### EXHIBIT NO. 172-A

[Stamped: Filed April 30, 1948, Foreign Agents Registration Section, Department of Justice]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION STATEMENT

*Pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended*

REGISTRATION NO. 464

For Six Months Period Ending March 31, 1948

1. (a) Name of Registrant.

New York Bureau of the Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R. (Tass).

(b) All other names used by Registrant during the period.

None.

(c) Address of principal office.

50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

(d) Name of person or persons in charge of principal office.

Alexander Georgievich Alexandrov.

3. If Registrant is a nonbusiness membership organization, state—

Inapplicable.

(a) Approximate number of members in the United States\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Approximate number of members outside the United States\_\_\_\_\_

Inapplicable.

4. (a) All persons who became partners, officers, directors, and similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection began:

Position, office, or nature of duties:

None.

(b) All persons who ceased to be partners, officers, directors, or similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection ended:

Reason for ending connection:

None.

5. (a) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which began to operate during the period.

Name and address of branch, unit, group, or organization	Nature of connection with registrant	Name and address of person in charge
Subbureau of the New York Bureau of the Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., 969 National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.	-----	Laurence Todd, 4805 Langdrum Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

(b) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which ceased to operate during the period.

Name of branch, unit, group, or organization:

Reason operations ceased:

None.

6. All persons who at any time during the year were foreign principals of Registrant.

Name and principal address:

Is person still a foreign principal of Registrant?

If not, give date connection ended

None.

7. Describe fully all activities of Registrant during the period for or in the interests of each foreign principal named under item 6.

Gathering and transmitting American news to the U. S. S. R.

8. Describe briefly all other businesses, occupations, and public activities in which Registrant engaged during the period.

None.

9. Furnish the following information as to all employees and other individuals, except those named under item 4, who during the period rendered any services or assistance to Registrant, with or without compensation, for or in the interests of any foreign principal named under item 6:

(a) All such employees and other individuals for whom Exhibits A have previously been filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of any changes during period in activities for Registrant or its foreign principals	Has connection with registrant ended?
Kenneth Durant, Jamaica, Vt.....	.....	No.
Esther Shields, 9 West 97th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Harry Freeman, 22 East 89th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Thurber Lewis, 328 West 47th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Timofei Remisov, 121 Madison Ave., New York City.....	.....	No.
Samuel Kraisur, Dahlonga Rd., Mohican Hills, Md., Washington, D. C.....	.....	No.
Emilio Delgado Rodriguez, 29 West 97th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
William Cunningham, 228 West 21st St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Harry Ross, 369 Bleecker St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Jean Montgomery, Marlyn Apartments, 39th St. and Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.....	.....	No.
Paul Burns, 294 West 11th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Sasha Small Lurie, 345 Bleecker St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Jerome Klein, 47 Morton St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Franklin Folsom, 142 East 27th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Bernard Freeman, 138 West 13th St., New York City, left Jan. 10, 1948.....	.....	Yes.
Frederick Van Wicken, 259 W. 11th St., New York City.....	.....	No.
Hays Jones, 270 Fort Washington Ave., New York City.....	.....	No.
Laurence Todd, 4805 Langdrum Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.....	.....	No.
Vladimir Morev, 430 West 119th St., New York City.....	.....	No.

(b) All such employees and other individuals for whom exhibits A have not been previously filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of services or assistance rendered	Has connection with registrant ended?
Kuzma Ilyashenko, 113 West 103d St., New York City.....	Staff writer.....	No.
Vera Groden, 101 West 60th St., New York City.....	Bookkeeper.....	No.
Anne Weissberg, 226 East 6th St., New York City.....	Teletypist.....	Yes; left Jan. 1, 1948.
Vincent Vaeearo, 254-A Grand Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.....	do.....	No.
Harry Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City, N. Y.....	do.....	No.
Ruth Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City, N. Y.....	Librarian.....	No.
Minnie Bunin, 101 West 60th St., New York City.....	Teletypist.....	No.
Julie De Witt, 2 Horatio St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	No.
Augusta Strauss, 2410 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C.....	Teletypist.....	Yes; left Nov. 19, 1947.
Jessie Harris, 45 Hawthorne St., Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Editorial assistant.....	No.
Olga Molnikova, 115 West 76th St., New York City.....	Student translator.....	Yes; left Nov. 14, 1947.
Alison Burroughs, 114 East 123d St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	No.
Evelyn Gross, 308 East 72d St., New York City.....	do.....	Yes; on leave of absence, Jan. 15, 1948.
Bluma Cohen, 65 71st St., Brooklyn, N. Y.....	do.....	Yes; left Jan. 31, 1948.
Rose Averett, 4121 49th St., Long Island City, N. Y.....	Switchboard operator.....	No.
Fred Nield, 75 West 55th St., New York City.....	Teletypist.....	No.
Anne Carroll, 29 Bethune St., New York City.....	Librarian.....	Yes; left Jan. 19.
Travis K. Hedrick, 3014 South Columbus St., Arlington, Va.....	Staff writer.....	No.
Corinne Lautman, 511 Roxboro Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Teletypist.....	No.
Micky Virden, 1328 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.....	do.....	No.

Filing of Exhibit A for all of the above names, except Kuzma Ilyashenko and Travis K. Hedrick, waived because they are clerical and nondiscretionary employees who are not engaged in writing, speaking, organization, or other public or political activities on behalf of Tass or otherwise.



## EXHIBIT No. 172-B

[Stamped: Filed November 1, 1948, Foreign Agents Registration Section, Department of Justice]

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

## SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION STATEMENT

*Pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents  
Registration Act of 1938, as Amended*

REGISTRATION NO. 464

For Six Months Period Ending September 30, 1948

## 1. (a) Name of Registrant.

New York Bureau of the Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R. (Tass).

## (b) All other names used by Registrant during the period.

None.

## (c) Address of principal office.

50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

## (d) Name of person or persons in charge of principal office.

Alexander Georgievich Alexandrov.

## 3. If Registrant is a nonbusiness membership organization, state—

Inapplicable.

## (a) Approximate number of members in the United States-----

## (b) Approximate number of members outside the United States-----

Inapplicable.

## 4. (a) All persons who became partners, officers, directors, and similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection began:

Position, office, or nature of duties:

None.

## (b) All persons who ceased to be partners, officers, directors, or similar officials of Registrant during the period.

Name and address of official:

Date connection ended:

Reason for ending connection:

None.

## 5. (a) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which began to operate during the period.

Name and address of branch, unit, group, or organization	Nature of connection with registrant	Name and address of person in charge
Subbureau of the New York Bureau of the Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., 969 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.	-----	Laurence Todd, 4805 Langdrum Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

## (b) All branches and local units of Registrant and all other component or affiliated groups or organizations which ceased to operate during the period.

Name of branch, unit, or organization:

Reason operations ceased:

None.

## 6. All persons who at any time during the period were foreign principals of Registrant.

Name and principal address:

Is person still a foreign principal of Registrant?

If not, give date connection ended:

The Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R.

7. Describe fully all activities of Registrant during the period for or in the interests of each foreign principal named under item 6.

Gathering and transmitting American news to the U. S. S. R.

8. Describe briefly all other businesses, occupations, and public activities in which Registrant engaged during the period.

None.

9. Furnish the following information as to all employees and other individuals, except those named under item 4, who during the period rendered any services or assistance to Registrant, with or without compensation, for or in the interests of any foreign principal named under item 6:

(a) All such employees and other individuals for whom Exhibit A have previously been filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of any changes during period in activities for registrant or its foreign principals	Has connection with registrant ended?
Kenneth Durant, Jamaica, Vt.	-----	No.
Esther Shields, 9 West 97th St., New York City	-----	No.
Harry Freeman, 22 East 89th St., New York City	-----	No.
Thurber Lewis, 328 West 47th St., New York City	-----	No.
Timofei Remisov, 121 Madison Ave., New York City	-----	No.
Boris Krylov, Washington, D. C.	Left, June 15, 1947	Yes.
Samuel Kfarsur, Dahlonaga Rd., Mohican Hills, Md., Washington, D. C.	-----	No.
Emilio Delgado Rodriguez, 29 West 97th St., New York City	-----	No.
William Cunningham, 328 West 21th St., New York City	-----	No.
Harry Ross, 369 Bleecker St., New York City	-----	No.
Jean Montgomery, Marlyn Apts., 39th St. and Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.	-----	No.
Paul Burns, 294 West 11th St., New York City	-----	No.
Sasha Small Lurie, 345 Bleecker St., New York City	-----	No.
Jerome Klein, 47 Morton St., New York City	-----	No.
Franklin Folsom, 142 East 27th St., New York City	-----	No.
Bernard Freeman, 138 West 13th St., New York City	-----	No.
Frederick Van Wicklen, 259 West 11th St., New York City	-----	No.
Hays Jones, 270 Fort Washington Ave., New York City	-----	No.
Laurence Todd, 4805 Langdrum Lane, Chevy Chase, Md	-----	No.

(b) All such employees and other individuals for whom exhibits A have not been previously filed.

Name and address of employee or other individual	Nature of services or assistance rendered	Has connection with registrant ended?
Vladimir Morev, 149-32 Union Turnpike, Flushing, Long Island	Staff writer	No.
Vera Groden, 101 West 60th St., New York City	Bookkeeper	No.
Anne Weissberg, 226 East 6th St., New York City	Teletypist	No.
Vincent Vaccaro, 254A Grand Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.	do.	No.
Harry Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City, N. Y.	do.	No.
Minnie Bunin, 101 West 60th St., New York City	do.	No.
Julie De Witt, 1328 Park Road N.W., Washington, D. C.	do.	No.
Angusta Strauss, 2410 20th St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	do.	No.
Ames Ogden Stewart, 8 East 10th St., New York City	do.	Yes; left Sept. 1, 1947.
Roberta Felsen, 101 West 60th St., New York City	Editorial assistant	Yes; left May 15, 1947.
Jessie Harris, 45 Hawthorne St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	do.	No.
Olga Melnikova, 115 West 76th St., New York City	Student translator	No.
Martha Deutscher, 2120 Thibout Ave., New York City	Librarian	Yes; left Apr. 13, 1947.
Alison Burroughs, 114 East 123d St., New York City	do.	No.
Evelyn Cross, 308 East 72d St., New York City	do.	No.
Ruth Fisher, 4309 47th Ave., Long Island City, N. Y.	do.	No.
Bhuma Cohen, 65 71st St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	do.	No.
Rose Averett, 4121 49th St., Long Island City, N. Y.	Switchboard operator	No.
Fred Nield, Jane West Hotel, 507 West St., New York City	Teletypist	No.

Filing of exhibit A for all of the above-named except Vladimir Morev waived because they are clerical and nondiscretionary employees who are not engaged in writing, speaking, organization, or other public or political activities on behalf of Tass or otherwise.

Mr. MORRIS. When Esther Lowell Shields, of the Tass News Agency, appeared before the committee, we asked her if she had in fact written for *Imprecor*, which is a publication of the Comintern. Miss Lowell—Mrs. Shields—denied that she had ever written for *Imprecor*. We have here a notation made by Mr. Mandel, the research director, which indicates that an article under the name of Esther Lowell, the name she used, did in fact appear.

Mr. MANDEL. The article under the name of Esther Lowell was a book review of Agnes Smedley's book *Chinese Destinies*, and was published in *International Press Correspondence*, official organ of *Communist International*, volume 14, No. 19, dated March 31, 1934, page 508, under the title "A Vivid Picture of Changing China."

Mr. MORRIS. That would not necessarily contradict Mrs. Shield's testimony because she would not necessarily consider a book review an article. At the same time, the name Esther Shields may have been used by the *Imprecor* people without her knowledge.

I have an article here by Paul F. Healy on Tass which I would like to have go into the record, Senator, because it has been referred to several times in the course of our Tass hearings.

Senator WATKINS. Is this a magazine which has been published?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; the *Saturday Evening Post*, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. It may be made a part of the record.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 173" and reads as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 173

[From the *Saturday Evening Post*, January 20, 1951]

#### STALIN'S AMERICAN SNOOPS

By Paul F. Healy

What kind of Americans are the "news" writers, who report on press conferences at the Pentagon or White House, directly to Moscow? Why do we let these paid agents of Russia claim the protection of United States citizenship and freedom of the press?

Gen. George C. Marshall, discussing foreign-policy strategy before the House Foreign Affairs Committee early in 1950, remarked that the Russians "certainly have a knowledge of our activities that we do not possess at all in respect to theirs." He nodded toward a redheaded woman who was swiftly taking notes at the press table nearby.

"Witness this young lady here today," Marshall continued. "You do not see her prototype at such meetings in the Soviet Union."

The general had pointed up a dangerous anomaly in United States-Russian relations. The redheaded woman was Miss Jean Montgomery, correspondent for Tass, the official Soviet "news" agency. After the hearing, she would freely and in detail inform Moscow of everything said that would be of interest to the Russian leaders.

Tass, in fact, is given the run of this wide-open country and the same rights to information as our own reporters, in striking contrast to the manner in which the half dozen American newsmen in Moscow are subjected to rigid censorship and otherwise straitjacketed in very red tape.

It is one of the humorless ironies of our time that Premier Stalin has been able to hire some competent American journalists to act as his informers in America and also write smear-America propaganda for the Russian press. Ten citizens of the United States are among the 19 reporters who serve the Soviets through Tass' main bureau in New York and its subbureau in Washington.

The Tass job obviously is not the kind for which aspiring young American journalists clamor. Its qualifications are unique and its rewards are questionable, to say the least—unless one is more interested in winning a Stalin



prize than a Pulitzer prize. True, there are no deadlines and no competitors to worry about, since Tass is a government-owned monopoly. But Tass wages—for the Americans—are below the scale. The job carries with it a social stigma. It often requires a talent for eavesdropping. It demands an adjustment to the indoctrinated Russian mind. And above all, it calls for a stubborn pro-Soviet point of view. As someone once said, there must be an easier—and better—way of making a living.

Who, then, are the Americans who choose to remain Stalin's pen pals under such occupational hazards and under present two-world tensions? By and large, they are intelligent, educated, and the products of upper- or middle-class backgrounds. But each of these, for one reason or another, acquired an obsessive dissatisfaction with the American system which eventually drove him, or her, into a blind belief in the rightness of the Soviet cause. Tass thus became a catalyst for their political feelings.

Let's take a look at the more prominent among them. The aforementioned Miss Montgomery, the 45-year-old daughter of a brilliant but erratic Pittsburgh architect, now dead, had a more hectic pre-Tass career than most of her comrades. A born rebel with a keenly receptive mind, she attended Antioch College, at Yellow Springs, Ohio. Among other things, she learned how to pull strings at Antioch and afterward she spent a year on a national tour with Tony Sarg's marionette show. But once having seen the country, she set out to reform it.

Soon she was running the New Jersey State office of the Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform, which, for once, put her on the side of the majority. However, it was the coming of the New Deal which gave Miss Montgomery some real outlets for her advanced ideas. As an administrative assistant in the Paper Codes Branch of the NRA, she was a leader in helping to found the first Federal Government workers' union, a forerunner of what was to become, through mergers, the United Public Workers of America, now expelled from the CIO for being communistic. Then she went into union work full time with the late Sidney Hillman's textile workers' organizing committee and subsequently was loaned, as a publicity worker, to the New York organizing office of Allen Haywood, who is now a CIO vice president. Haywood soon returned the clever little redhead, because he didn't like either her attitude or her politics. In 1937 she caught on with a weekly news magazine as a labor expert, but she was fired in a matter of weeks.

For a change of pace, Miss Montgomery next infiltrated, of all places, Wall Street. Starting as a secretary, she soon worked up to stocks and bonds share-trading in the investment firm of Joseph W. Burden, a socially prominent New Yorker and a Roosevelt Democrat. This job blew up when Burden was sentenced to Sing Sing for having fleeced his friends to the tune of \$343,000.

After these experiences, our heroine was ripe for Tass, joining its New York office in 1941 and transferring to Washington 4 years later. Today she covers Capitol Hill with cool and confident pride, apologizing to no one for the nature of her vocation. She lives with her mother, who has never been favorably impressed with Stalin, so, instead of talking about the latest 5-year plan, they play gin rummy.

Like other Tassites, Miss Montgomery explains that she is not permitted to be a member of any political party. Perhaps unaware of this occupational gimmick, Senator Tom Connally once turned to her before starting a press conference and inquired bluntly, "By the way, how long have you been a 'Communist?'"

"Why, Senator, I'm not a Communist," she protested.

"Well, you'd better not let your bosses find out," Connally quipped.

Tass employees never seek to justify their way of life. They insist, with straight faces, that working for Tass is just like working for any news agency and that they are not being disloyal to the United States. Certainly they would shout objections if one tabbed them as incipient traitors. Nonetheless, Tass has become a provocative word in Washington, and the 4 Americans and 1 Russian who serve Tass there cast a shadow far out of proportion to their numbers. For Tass, like a deadpan "heavy" in a Hitchcock movie thriller, can excite suspicion without making a single overt move.

Being buttonholed by a press agent of the Kremlin sometimes dismays and irritates Senators. For example, Connally, when he was approached by Miss Montgomery as he was leaving for a conference with President Truman after the outbreak of the Korean war, froze and pointedly escaped into a Capitol elevator. Similarly, Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, once angrily refused to answer a question off the record about the hydrogen bomb, with Tass present.

Some lawmakers joke about being tapped for information by Stalin's stooges. Senator Eugene Millikin, a Colorado Republican, has told a Tass reporter with a chuckle, "If there's any question about this quote, refer Uncle Joe directly to me."

Significantly, Tass correspondents never ask questions of the President or the Secretary of State at press conferences; anything they did ask probably would set off a wave of speculation by American planners and pundits. But Tass' people are good listeners. Last spring White House correspondents felt it necessary to telephone the Pentagon office of garrulous Louis Johnson, then Secretary of Defense, to tip him off that Tass had been taking in the candid remarks he had made to them on the white House steps a half hour earlier. Johnson's subject had been the condition of the Armed Forces.

Covering the State Department, one of the truly veteran newsmen is the dean of American Tass correspondents—68-year-old, anachronistic Laurence Todd, whose case history represents a curious flight from his heritage. Todd's antecedents came to New England on one of the first shiploads. One of his ancestors fought as a colonel in the American Revolution and another was a founder of the Republican Party in Jackson, Mich. Raised in Nottawa, Mich., "Larry" Todd was educated at the University of Michigan and then undertook a career which began with the Kalamazoo Gazette and continued through San Francisco newspapers and several press associations.

As a young man, Todd, who had had a firm religious upbringing, was puritanical almost to the point of asceticism. He was also a chronic dissenter from most of his fellow Americans, and in 1904, after listening to a speech by Eugene V. Debs and reading Edward Bellamy's *Equality*, a novel about the alleged utopian life under socialism, he joined the Socialist Party. Gradually socialism became his faith. During 1915 and 1916 he interrupted his news career to be secretary to Meyer London, of New York City, when London, a Socialist, served his first term in Congress. London, though born in Russian, was a mild Socialist in the old European tradition, and soon Todd had moved to his left.

With free enterprise skyrocketing all around him in the 1920's, Todd bitterly turned to the violent Soviet version of socialism. He became Washington correspondent for the Federated Press, a labor news service which in recent years has been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee as Communist-dominated and, in 1923, he started as part-time correspondent for the Bolsheviks' first news service; 10 years later he became Washington bureau chief for Tass.

Today Todd lives sedately in Chevy Chase, a conservative Washington suburb, and looks as staid as any old-fashioned college professor. Academic in his manner, he is tall, angular, and perpetually ruddy, perhaps because he is exercised so frequently about what is wrong with his native land. For Todd is intellectually a very angry man.

In the State Department pressroom, where he is sometimes pointed out as a curiosity to newcomers, he will defend the Soviets' behavior as long as anyone will listen. His working for Tass, he has explained, simply means that he believes the Soviets are showing the way to world peace. Oddly, he still calls himself a Socialist. He probably would not be recognized as such by this country's No. 1 Socialist, the Soviet-hating Norman Thomas.

Todd's bifocal political philosophy was scrutinized to a degree back in 1934, when he was summoned before a House Select Committee investigating the source of a charge by William A. Wirt, superintendent of schools in Gary, Ind., that the United States then was in the process of a "deliberately planned revolution." Wirt testified that at a dinner party attended by several second-round New Deal Brain Trusters, he had been astounded to hear Todd say:

"We believe that we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin. We all think Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerensky of this revolution."

Todd categorically denied that he said this, as did the other dinner guests called to the stand, and the three Democratic committee members disbelieved Wirt. But the two Republican committee members, in a minority report, declared that the hearings had only scratched the surface and amounted to a whitewash of Todd and his friends. Incidentally, one of Todd's chums in that period was Lee Pressman, who was then occupying a Communist cell in the Agriculture Department, Pressman himself now admits.

At one point in the Wirt hearings, Todd was asked, "Are you one of those people who desire to seed a red flag waving from the dome of the Capitol?" Todd argued that it would be embarrassing to him, as the employee of a foreign government,

to have to answer the question. Congressional committees were easier on reluctant witnesses in those days, and Todd was let off with this novel excuse. But he was rebuked in the minority report for having grandiosely described Tass as "the Associated Press of Russia." The report pointed out that Tass "is in no sense an honest news agency, but is a mere propaganda agency of the Soviet Government."

Tass is surely the busiest and the farthest-flung propaganda service in the world. Its 1,000-plus correspondents from all over the globe feed distorted information 24 hours a day to the Kremlin's vast captive audiences in the U. S. S. R., Red China, and the satellite nations. But they also do aboveboard intelligence work and function as key adjuncts to Soviet consular posts.

Until 1946, for example, Todd reported to the Russian Embassy regularly. The Soviet diplomats often acted as though they couldn't make a move without him, and he was sometimes ordered to report to the Embassy on the double. His information and advice were considered so indispensable that when he was hospitalized for a time the Embassy frequently telephoned the Tass bureau, inquiring impatiently, "Why does he have to be sick for so long?" Todd also used to sit in on closed-door meetings of the satellite diplomats and candidly appraise American policies and leaders.

But suddenly, on October 12, 1948, Tass replaced him as Washington bureau chief with 30-year-old Mikhail Fedorov, fresh from Moscow. This was in keeping with the Russians' postwar policy of filling important Tass posts with Russians. Todd was unhappy about the demotion, but there was nothing he could do about it. The "mark of Tass" is indelible. Ex-Tass employees have no future in the non-Communist news field. Most employers shun them like lepers.

While Tass reporters in this country suffer no discrimination on the part of their capitalistic colleagues, they are considered to be professionally freakish by many Americans. There was the girl who had just been hired by Tass and was invited out to dinner by some old friends. Aware that they worked for the Government, the girl gaily warned them upon arrival that she was now in the pay of Tass. Her host and hostess smiled bravely and reassured her that as Democrats they always took the large view in such matters; that, after all, this is a free country, and she shouldn't feel that her employer would be held against her. It was not until several hours later that they discovered to their horror they had mistakenly understood her to say she was working for Senator Taft. At that point the temperature grew noticeably cooler.

In war-jittery Washington, working for Tass has become so controversial an issue it has split up husbands and wives, and in one celebrated case it was responsible for a tragic father-daughter crack-up. A few years ago a gossip columnist disclosed that Miss Euphemia ("Mickey") Virden, the 22-year-old post-debutante daughter of John C. Virden, a special assistant to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, was running the teletype—she also covers an occasional press conference—in the Tass Washington office.

A furor followed, when Representative Fred Crawford, a Michigan Republican, called upon Sawyer to demand Virden's resignation because he was "so close by flesh and blood to the Soviet agency." Virden, a brilliant Cleveland industrialist and a religious man who hates atheistic communism, offered to resign, but reconsidered, at the pleading of his friends and a warm note from Truman assuring him that "my faith in you is unshaken." However, when his hitch in Government was over, Virden returned to his business in Cleveland, still sick at heart over the ideological gulf between him and the daughter on whom he had once doted.

When Mickey threw in with the Russians, he had sensed a perhaps irrevocable separation. In the jargon of the doctrinaire, she had explained she "wanted to learn journalism, but not in the lying capitalistic press." A slender, coltish girl, with handsome dark hair and large brown eyes, she had begun her cerebral journey leftward in her teens, through wide, precocious reading and a concern about racial injustice. Soon she came to look upon her successful father as the very symbol of the capitalist society. Then, at Sarah Lawrence College, where she was a brilliant avant-garde pupil and got elected president of the Student Council, she fell under the influence of the late Genevieve Taggard, an English teacher and a poetess, who contributed to the literary magazines. Miss Taggard also wrote for Communist publications, and she was the wife of Kenneth Durant, who headed up the American Tass operation from its inception in 1923 until he retired due to ill health in 1944. New York is headquarters for Tass in this country.



A word about Durant, who strongly influenced Todd and who, in many ways, is the most fascinating member of the Tass gallery of characters. The red sheep of an old and respected Philadelphia socialite family, Durant first went to the aid of the Bolsheviks by doing publicity for C. A. K. Martens, who was sent here by the revolutionaries after the First World War in search of diplomatic recognition. Tall, well-pressed, and aristocratic looking, Durant had a sophisticated prose style and a ruthless wit. Holding his subordinates under the spell of his sardonic charm, he stood no nonsense from anyone expressing mild misgivings about what the Soviets were up to. A colorful and dominating figure among New York's Greenwich Village intellectuals in the 1920's, he made several trips to the Soviet Union, always donning a peaked workman's cap when he crossed the Russian border. Durant often seemed to be more intrigued with the conspiratorial nature of the Soviets than with their ideology.

The American who has made the American Tass operation click since the departure of Durant is 44-year-old Harry Freeman, who is deputy to Ivan Beglov, the poker-faced Russian boss of Tass in this country. Quiet and obsequious, likable Freeman has a peculiar ability for getting along with Russians. He also is a skillful news-desk man for Tass, having put in 20 years with the agency after learning the tricks of the trade and of communism as city editor for the Communist New York Daily Worker. Freeman was born in Brooklyn, of a Russia-born father who was a moderately prosperous contractor, and he married Russia-born Vera Shapiro, also known as Vera Schapp, a member of the radical American Labor Party. Freeman, who has steered clear of political shenanigans since his Daily Worker days, is a brother of the novelist Joseph Freeman, a founder and one-time editor of the Communist magazine, *New Masses*.

Harry Freeman radios or cables—from the Tass office in New York—an average report of 6,000 to 15,000 words a day to Moscow about America. Most of it is never seen by the Russian worker and muzhik, but is circulated among those in Moscow who are trusted to know the truth. This part of the report includes speech texts, all types of Government handouts, technical and business reports, and whatever documents and inside information can be picked up. Tass reporters not only get around where other Soviet representatives would be considered off limits, but they can move their information home cheaper and faster. The press rate is 6½ cents a word, compared with the 11½ cents the Russian diplomats pay for official business, and the 23 cents a word commercial rate. Stalin spends approximately \$25,000 a month to maintain the American Tass operation, according to Tass. Nobody doubts that he would be willing to pay considerably more than that.

Freeman's assistant in the New York office is Esther Shields, who described herself in the Justice Department's foreign agents registration file as a staff writer, housewife, and mother. In her time she has also done picket duty in at least one famous strike and contributed to the *New Masses*. It was Esther, a prim-appearing woman of 50 years, who mounted the barricades for the Russians when some of the Tass Americans, depressed by their low salaries, met to discuss organizing a union. Esther took the floor and argued that the idea was ridiculous and insulting to Tass. She asserted it would be unthinkable, for instance, even to consider calling a strike against the worker's best friend, the Soviet Union. The project died.

Esther is married to Arthur Shields, of the Daily Worker staff. Interestingly, the Tass Americans do not share the Tass Russians' evident contempt for the bumbling Communist Party of the United States. Todd has even gone to the Russian Embassy to put in a good word for Rob Hall, the Daily Worker's Washington columnist.

Hall and the Tass Americans are, of course, brothers under the skin. He is a rather extreme example of the shaggy-haired, pipe-smoking southpaw intellectual. Born into a typically conservative Mississippi family, Hall was educated at Columbia University, where he became a campus radical, a bachelor of arts and a Phi Beta Kappa. In 1930 he visited Russia and then married Russia-born Clara Stern. In 1944 he became a member of the powerful national committee of the Communist Political Association, now dissolved. Today, when he isn't applying the party line to the Washington scene for his readers, he directs Communist Party activities in the area and keeps a tight rein on various Red-front groups. He also appears to be an arm-in-arm pal of virtually every left-winger who has run afoul of a congressional committee.

In New York, the Tass Russians are elusive lone wolves who bypass foreign-press cocktail parties and are seldom seen, except at the United Nations. But



in Washington, bureau chief Fedorov grapples conscientiously with the customs of the natives. When he appeared for the first time on the White House beat, press-room veterans pointed out that a jug of spirits is acceptable dues for a newcomer. The next morning Fedorov, who is broad-shouldered, broad-faced and as melancholy as any character in Chekhov, dejectedly explained that the third secretary of the Embassy had gone off to New York with the key to the wine cellar in his pocket. The day after that the Muscovite showed up for work with two bottles of the Embassy's finest vodka. Soon the White House correspondents were calling him "Mike" and baiting him about life under the commissars.

Mike is living proof that the Kremlin places no great value on journalistic experience as a requirement for a Russian Tass reporter. Fedorov's preparation for his present job was 5 years in the Russian aircraft industry and a degree as a graduate aeronautical engineer. The Russians prefer their agents to be double- or triple-threat men. Jacob Lomakin, a recent Soviet consul general in New York, had been a Tass editor before that in Moscow. The late Constantine Oumansky became managing director of all Tass operations during World War II, immediately after he had been Ambassador to the United States and an appendage of Soviet Intelligence here. In some countries, government officials have learned only after the departure of a Soviet diplomat that he had acted as a Tass reporter on the sly at the same time.

Many Tass reporters have been suspected of outright espionage and some of them have been caught at it. A splendid example of the Tass spy breed is one Vladimir Rogov, who directed the main Tass bureau in Nationalist China from Shanghai, while simultaneously heading up the far eastern Soviet spy ring. When the Chinese Reds took over, Rogov moved his two-faced operation to the new government's seat at Peiping, presumably to spy on Russia's ally.

Canada has suffered notoriously from trusting Tass. In 1946 the Canadian correspondents had grown moderately fond of a couple of Tass reporters—Nicolai (Big Nick) Zheivinov and Nicolai (Little Nick) Afanasiev. When "Big Nick" suddenly announced that he was being recalled to Moscow, the press gallery members in Ottawa gave him a farewell cocktail party. The Russky rose to the occasion and delivered a grandiloquent speech of friendship for Canada. The Canadians were touched.

Immediately after he left Canada, Zheivinov was named by the Royal Canadian Commission as a key member—under the cover name "Martin"—of the Soviet spy ring which had been stealing atomic secrets from the Canadian Government. There was some bitter talk about expelling Afanasiev, but presently he said that he, too, was being summoned home. However, months later a Canadian newsman visiting in New York bumped into Afanasiev in the Associated Press Building. Puzzled, the Canadian invited "Little Nick" to have a drink and chat. The Russian replied that he was busy at the moment, but that if the Canadian would call at the Tass office upstairs later, they could go to dinner together. The Ottawa man did call at the Tass office at the dinner hour, only to informed blandly at the door—no visitor gets inside the railing—that no such person as Nicolai Afanasiev was employed there and that, in fact, they had never heard of him. "Little Nick" never turned up again.

The name Tass stands for "Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union." Its first "chief responsible leader" was Jacob Doletzky, a Polish-born, old-line Bolshevik who was liquidated—along with some of his subeditors—in the notorious purge of 1937 as a "Trotskyite bandit." Today the big boss of Tass is Nicolai Palgunov, affectionately known as Pal the Goon by Tass Americans. Under Palgunov, Tass propaganda is noted for its heavy-handed distortion, bald editorializing, and significant omissions. Tass will stop at nothing in attempts to document its story that the United States is on the verge of economic collapse and at the same time is trying to needle up a third world war. When Tass writers are hard-up for an authority to quote, they fall back on the Daily Worker, which is like approvingly quoting one's own echo, or simply dream up the name of a fictitious American newspaper. Tass does not sell its service to non-Communist countries—it has mutual free-exchange deals with the Associated Press and United Press. So, for foreign news, the Daily Worker is obliged to rely on the United Press, which it rewrites, and a kind of demi-Tass agency called Telepress, which supplies Soviet-shaped news to Communist newspapers from Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Remember when Louis Johnson was hacking away at the armed services budget, over the protests of many military men, and paving the way for our unpreparedness in the Korean war? Well, here's the way Tass interpreted the American scene at that time, via Pravda:

"NEW YORK (Tass), Feb. 9.—U. S. Defense Secretary Johnson's report on the status of the American military machine (National Defense Establishment), published with the obvious purpose of strengthening the new wave of military hysteria engulfing the U. S. A., shows that the U. S. is working out far-reaching aggressive plans \* \* \* the contents of this report show that U. S. military circles are in control of American foreign policy. The author unwittingly cites facts in the report which exposes the American propaganda myth that U. S. military preparations are designed for "defense" from some "danger of aggression" \* \* \* the whole world knows that the U. S. A. has not been and is not threatened."

The tone of Tass is frequently snide. Pravda carried this cryptic bit of sarcasm in 1949:

"WASHINGTON (Tass), Aug. 3.—Truman has expressed satisfaction with the "progress" in the sphere of atomic energy. Truman's assertions that the commission is also carrying out a program of research work to utilize atomic energy to "improve human welfare" sound strange.

Tass takes a poor view of American humor where it concerns the Russians. Once, when a comedian had posed as an outspoken Russian general to entertain graduates of the FBI training academy at a dinner, the Tass story out of Washington called it an "obscene hoax" which "revealed the taste and cultural level of American policemen."

The average Tass story is slanted by the reporter who writes it, given a harder or, perhaps, different twist as it passes through the New York office, and then treated to a final Marxian pummeling in Moscow before it is fit for public consumption. As they appeared in the Russian press, the Tass accounts of the trial of Valentin Gubitchev, the Russian engineer at the U. N., could not have been enlightening to the Russian reader. These stories ignored the fact that Gubitchev had been charged with conspiracy to commit espionage, failed to mention the presence of a jury, and fulminated against the FBI for having picked him up. Judith Coplon, Gubitchev's accomplice in the Justice Department, was identified with this single reference in one story: "The American girl, Miss Coplon, who was tried with Gubitchev, was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment."

On Stalin's own basis, the United States would be justified in restricting or censoring Tass correspondents in this country. Stalin told Harold Stassen in his interview in 1947 that foreign correspondents are subject to censorship in Russia because the foreign press had been guilty of sending erroneous reports on the Soviet Union which the Russians regarded as unfriendly. But Congress for the present is going along with the State Department's view that Tass should be tolerated in the Government's press galleries as a necessary evil. This policy is founded on two arguments. One is that giving Tass the same access to legitimate news as other foreign newsmen is the most spectacular way to practice what we preach about freedom of the press. The other is that any clamping down on Tass surely would bring reprisals against American newsmen behind the Iron Curtain.

Many Washington officials feel, however, that instead of putting the lid on Tass, the State Department should demand some reciprocity, some sort of quid pro quo, on the issue of Russian-American press coverage. This attitude was hinted at publicly by Representative James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania, when he noticed Tass' presence at a House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting.

Fulton said, "I only hope that in Moscow we will get the same treatment. In order to be fair, we in the United States like to do it in the open, and we hope the Tass correspondent will sit down with her fellow United States correspondents in Moscow on the same basis in the near future."

Mr. MANDEL. The date on that article is January 20, 1951.

Mr. MORRIS. Just a few more things here. We have a publication of the United States Information Agency.

That is right, isn't it?

Mr. MANDEL. United States Information Service.

Mr. MORRIS. United States Information Service, which has a reference—Mr. Mandel will identify it.

Mr. MANDEL. It is a magazine called Problems of Communism, No. 2, volume 5, March, April, 1956, published by the United States Information Service.

On page 7 is this reference to Tass:

Only one of the Soviet newspaper organizations can compete with Pravda in scope, though not in rank. This is Tass, the monopoly news agency. In addition to its news service, Tass operates a photo service, a mat and plastic cut service, Presklishe, a radio service, a feature syndicate press bureau, and a confidential news service distributed under seal to metropolitan editors and high officials of state and party.

That is footnoted as being from Benton's notes of an interview with Palgunov. Also from Palgunov's Fundamentals of News in the Newspapers, Moscow University Publishing House, Moscow University, 1955.

Mr. MORRIS. I ask that those exhibits be placed in the record with some portion of the Tass testimony \* \* \*.

Senator WATKINS. It is so ordered.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 174" and may be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I have two more news accounts which indicate that India expelled a Tass correspondent. The news story is in the Washington Daily News of April 14, 1952, and the New York Times of April 15, 1954, and the Ottawa Citizen of the same day, which indicated that Canada expelled Mr. Ivan Tsvetkov from Canada.

Senator WATKINS. You want those in the record?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. It will be done.

(The newspaper accounts referred to were marked "Exhibit Nos. 175, 175-A, and 175-B" and read as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 175

[Washington Daily News, April 14, 1952, p. 2]

#### INDIA BOOTS OUT TASS

The Russian Government is going to call home the chief correspondent of the Tass news agency in New Delhi, the capital of India. This is a result of protests by the Indian Government against "distorted" Moscow broadcasts about the nation.

Whatever this correspondent wrote about India, it could be no more outrageous than the fantastic falsehoods the Russians print and broadcast about the United States every day. Many of these "news items" are alleged to be based upon Tass dispatches from its representatives in the United States.

How does it happen that India, a relatively weak nation, can make Russia back down in this matter and we cannot?

One reason, of course, is that it is Russian policy to cultivate friendship with India in an effort to soften it up for eventual capture by communism.

Another is that the United States Government has done nothing about Russian "reporting" from this country except to complain about it now and then.

Here we play into the hands of the Kremlin by pretending that correspondents of Tass are legitimate foreign newspapermen. We give them all the privileges we extend to correspondents from Great Britain, France and the other free nations. They even are allowed to attend press conferences of the President.

Tass correspondents acknowledge they are representatives of the Russian Government. They are so registered with the Justice Department. The chief Tass correspondent in Washington is not even a newspaperman by profession: he is an aviation engineer—and doubtless an able one who manages to pick up much interesting technical information for his bosses in Moscow while on his "news gathering" rounds.

When a committee of newspaper editors suggested last year that Tass correspondents be barred from Congress' press galleries, the committee of United States correspondents which govern the galleries asked the State Department for its recommendation. The State Department responded with a weasel-worded



reply in which it declined to make a recommendation. The committee then voted to permit the Tass correspondents to remain.

We said then that this action was a mistake. We still think so, and we think the incident in India helps to prove it.

These spies for Russia ought to be barred from the press galleries, and those who are Russians ought to be expelled from the United States. It would take no new laws to do it.

We deport undesirable aliens for lesser reasons. But we tolerate Russian espionage and propaganda.

#### EXHIBIT No. 175-A

[New York Times, April 14, 1954]

#### CANADIAN TASS MAN RECALLED

Special to the New York Times

OTTAWA, April 14.—Ivan V. Tsvetkov, Ottawa correspondent of Tass, the Soviet news agency, has been ordered by his office to return to the Soviet Union.

#### EXHIBIT No. 175-B

[The Ottawa Citizen, April 13, 1954, p. 9]

#### RECALL TASS REPORTER TO RUSSIA

By the Canadian Press

Tass, the official Russian news agency, has recalled its Ottawa correspondent.

Ivan V. Tsvetkov, 35, informed the parliamentary press gallery Wednesday that he has been ordered back to Russia. He has been a member of the gallery since last September when he was able to satisfy members who had raised objections to his membership application in March 1953.

His original application was rejected by a general meeting of the seventy-odd members of the gallery on grounds that Mr. Tsvetkov came to Canada on a diplomatic passport and was attached to the Russian Embassy here. Later, he obtained a nondiplomatic passport and was accepted as a gallery member.

Tass correspondents have been regarded with some suspicion since a royal commission disclosed that a Tass correspondent, Nikolai Zheveinov, was attached to a wartime Russian spy ring. This was the ring exposed by Igor Gouzenko, Russian Embassy cipher clerk who sought asylum in Canada in 1945.

(The following editorial later was ordered into the record at this point:)

#### EXHIBIT 175-C

[New York World Telegram, July 13, 1954, p. 26]

#### TASS MEN EXPOSED

Vladimir Petrov, former Soviet Embassy secretary in Australia, testifying before an Australian royal commission, said every Tass reporter outside the Iron Curtain is a Russian secret police official.

Tass is the news agency of the Soviet Government.

The job of a Tass man on foreign assignment, Petrov continued, is to represent himself to other newspapermen as just another journalist so he may have more contacts to gather information useful to Russia. But he is under orders from the Kremlin at all times and carries out his assignment as a bona fide spy. The stories he sometimes writes are a sideline.

Petrov's former job, before he defected, was to keep an eye on the Tass man in Australia who has since gone back to Moscow.

The Petrov testimony substantiates what we have long contended—that Tass representatives in this country are frauds as newspapermen. Yet they have the same press privileges as other correspondents at the White House, the Capitol, and elsewhere in Washington. They are free to roam the country, in contrast to American correspondents in Russia.

We believe it's time for a crackdown on these Tass agents in the United States. Let's be realistic about it—accept them for what they are, as Petrov disclosed their duties, and stop treating them as authentic newsmen.

MR. MANDEL. This one is from the records of Gen. Charles Willoughby, and is headed GHQ, FEC, Military Intelligence Section, General Staff, appendixes to a partial documentation of the Sorge espionage case miscellaneous records, special branch, Shanghai Municipal Police.

Consecutive exhibit No. 32, part II, section B, p. 115, headed "Tass."

Tass established a branch in Shanghai in April 1932, when V. Rover opened an office at 19 Museum Road. The location of the agency was moved in 1933 when J. Chernoff replaced Rover and again in June 1934, when it was moved to the fifth floor, 20 Canton Road, its location as of 29 July 1936. The manager at that time was Andrew Ivanovitch Sotoff, who replaced Chernoff in February 1935. The permanent foreign staff members were: R. L. Wikmen and his wife, and L. Lidov, Soviet citizens. Several foreigners were associated with the outside organization, and among those who had been seen visiting the offices were Agnes Smedley, Frank Glass, Granitch (Voice of China), Randal Gould, J. B. Powell, and V. Abolnik, Pekin Tass agent. Mrs. Sotoff was manager of the American Book & Supply Co., 841 Bubbling Well Road, and it was reported that Hayton Fleet, a British subject, would take over the outside Tass organization in the near future. Tass was run on the same lines as other news agencies; however, all messages transmitted to Moscow were censored by the U. S. S. R. consulate prior to dispatch.

The only local press that frequently published Tass messages was the China Daily Herald.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show that no conclusion has been drawn from the article just read by Mr. Mandel, that the information was read into the record in connection with our Tass hearings, and no inference is necessarily made.

Senator WATKINS. The record will so show.

# INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

A	Page
Abolnik, V. (Pekin Tass agent)-----	470
American Book & Supply Co.-----	470
American fliers-----	438
Antioch College-----	412
Army, United States-----	435
Artkino -----	421

B	Page
Baltimore-----	427
Benton's notes-----	468
Billings Searchlight-----	417
Brandon Films-----	421
Bridgeport Herald-----	418, 419
Budget, Bureau of-----	419, 420
Burden Agency, The-----	413
Burden, Joseph W-----	412

C	Page
Canada-----	468
"Canadian Tass Man Recalled"-----	469
Canton Road, 20-----	470
Capitol Hill-----	413, 415, 420
Chernoff, J-----	470
Chester, Pa-----	436
Chicago-----	417, 421
Chicago Daily News-----	417
Chicago Daily Times-----	417
Chicago Evening American-----	417
Chicago Evening Post-----	417
China Daily Herald-----	470
"Chinese Destinies" by Agnes Smedley-----	461
Christmas morning-----	437
CIO-----	412
Cleveland Public Library-----	422
Cleveland, Ohio-----	422
Cobb, David-----	411
Attorney for Jean Montgomery-----	411
Attorney for Alden Todd-----	435
Columbia Broadcasting System reporter-----	437
Columbia Pictures-----	423
Comintern-----	461
Communist-----	415, 420, 427, 429, 431, 432, 436, 437
Communist International-----	461
Communist meetings-----	419, 424
Communist Party-----	415, 416, 420, 424, 429, 430, 431, 436, 437
Communist Party, District of Columbia-----	427
Communist Party, newspaper unit-----	424
Communist Party, Robert H. Hall newspaper unit-----	416, 419
Congress-----	413, 415
Contemporary Films-----	421



	Page
D	
Daily Report for Executives.....	427
DeCaux, Len.....	412
DeKuyper Co.....	417
Democratic Party.....	430
E	
Eastland, Senator.....	411
Einhorn, Nat.....	431
Public relations for Embassy of Poland.....	431
Embassies.....	428
Espionage.....	432
Exhibit No. 169—State Department press release January 15, 1953, No. 27, re Yuri V. Novikov.....	433
Exhibit No. 170—Justice Department press release, January 15, 1953, re indictment of two naturalized citizens on charges of espionage for Soviet Russia, Otto Verber and Kurl L. Ponger, conspiring with Yuri V. Novikov.....	433
Exhibit No. 171—"Such Is Life," by Jeanne Perkins Harmon, chapters 11 and 12.....	438-450
Exhibit No. 172—September 3, 1947, registration (No. 464) filed by Tass, pursuant to section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 with Justice Department.....	451-456
Exhibit No. 172-A—March 31, 1948, supplemental registration (No. 464) filed by Tass.....	456
Exhibit No. 172-B—September 30, 1948, supplemental registration (No. 464) filed by Tass.....	459-460
Exhibit No. 173—Article from Saturday Evening Post, January 20, 1951, "Stalin's American Snoops," by Paul F. Healy.....	461-467
Exhibit No. 174—"Problems of Communism," No. 2, volume 5, March, April 1946, published by United States Information Service.....	469
Exhibit No. 175—Article from Washington Daily News, April 14, 1952, page 2, "India Boots Out Tass".....	468-469
Exhibit No. 175-A—Article from New York Times, April 14, 1954, "Can- adian Tass Man Recalled".....	469
Exhibit No. 175-B—Article from the Ottawa Citizen, April 15, 1954, page 9, "Recall Tass Reporter to Russia," by the Canadian Press.....	469
Exhibit No. 175-C—Article from New York World-Telegram, July 13, 1954, page 26, "Tass Men Exposed".....	469-470
F	
Fascist Party.....	430
Federated Press.....	419, 431, 435-437
Federov (chief of Washington Tass bureau).....	414
Fifth amendment.....	419, 424, 429, 436, 437, 451
Fleet, Hayton.....	470
Folsom, Franklin.....	450
142 East 27th Street, New York City.....	450
Employee of Tass.....	450
Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.....	450
Forer, Joseph.....	417, 421, 426, 428
Attorney for John B. Stone.....	417
Attorney for Alexander Sherman.....	421
Attorney for Natalie Lamken.....	426
Attorney for Corinne Lautman.....	428
Freeman, Harry (head of New York Tass bureau).....	414, 415
"Fundamentals of News" in the newspapers.....	468
G	
General Electric Co., Lynn, Mass.....	427
Georgetown Theater, Washington.....	422, 423
GHQ, FEC, Military Intelligence Section.....	470
Glass, Frank.....	470
Goodman, Charles.....	428
Gould, Randall.....	470
Granich (Voice of China).....	470

	Page
H	
Harmon, Jeanne Perkins (Mrs.)	437, 438
Healy, Paul F.	461
Herald American	417
Herald Examiner	417
Hoffberg Productions (New York)	421, 423
Hungarian Embassy	426

I	
Illinois Central Railroad	417
Imprecorr	461
India	468
"India Boots Out Tass"	468
Internal Security Subcommittee	414, 417, 421, 425, 427, 437, 438
International Press Correspondence	461

J	
Jewish Ledger (newspaper)	426
Justice Department	433, 451-460
Press release, January 15, 1953	433

K	
Kondakova, Mr. (Washington bureau of Tass)	414

L	
Labor Relations Reporter	427
Labor Trends	419
Lamken, Natalie (testimony of)	425-427, 431
1724 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.	426
Joseph Forer, attorney	426
Music teacher	426
Employed on Jewish Ledger	426
Previously taught English to foreigners	426
Worked 7½ years for Bureau of National Affairs	427
World War II worked at General Electric Co., Lynn, Mass.	427
Junior caseworker, department of public welfare in Baltimore	427
Fifth amendment re Communist Party	427
Lautman, Corrine	425, 427
Testimony of	428-431
Joseph Forer, attorney	428
526 Sheridan Street NW., Washington, D. C.	428
Robert Lautman, photographer, husband	428
1949 employed by United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America	428-429
1947-49 employed by Tass	429
Employed by National City Bank, New York	429
Corrine Pressman, maiden name	429
Fifth amendment re Communist Party	429
Lautman, Robert	428
Lidov, L.	470
Life magazine	437
Lowell, Esther	461
Lynn, Mass.	427

M	
Mandel, Benjamin	411, 425
McGranery, Attorney General James P.	433
McNanus, Robert	411
Milhailovich, General	438
Execution of by Tito	438
Montana	417
Montgomery, Jean	420, 424, 427, 436
Testimony of	411-417, 431-435
5041 12th Street NE	411
David Cobb, attorney	411
Antioch College	411-412

	Page
Montgomery, Jean—Continued	
Administrative Assistant in NRA	412
Textile Workers Organizing Committee	412
Paper Industries Coordinator	412
Joseph W. Burden Agency	412
Employed by Tass, 1941–July 1955	413
Morris, Robert	411
Moscow	413, 470
Moscow University Publishing House	468
Museum Road, 19	470

## N

National Affairs, Bureau of Washington	427
National City Bank, New York	429
National Press Building	429
Nazi Party	430
Newspaper Guild	437, 438
Newspaper Guild in New York	438
Newsweek magazine	418, 419
New York	412, 413, 415, 423, 429, 438
New York Morning Telegraph	423
New York Times, April 15, 1954	468, 469
New York World-Telegram	469
Novikov, Yuri V.	432, 433
Diplomatic corps of Soviet Embassy	432
NRA	412

## O

"On the Washington Record"	417
OPA	418
Solid Fuels Division	418
Oil Division	418
Ottawa Citizen	468, 469
OWI	418

## P

Palgunov	468
Paper Industries Coordinator	412
Paramonov, Mr.	414
Reporter, Washington bureau of Tass, 1955	414
Persona non grata	432
Petrov, Vladimir	469
Poland, Embassy of	424, 426, 431
Ponger, Kurl L.	433
Powell, J. B.	470
Pravda	468
Presidential press conference	413
Presklishe	468
Pressman, Corrine. (See Corrine Lautman.)	
Pressman, Lee	431
"Problems of Communism," No. 2, vol. 5, March, April 1956	467
Public welfare, department of	427

## R

"Recall Tass Reporter to Russia"	469
Republican Party	430
Rosenberg trial	432
Rosenbergs, Committee for	432
Rover, V.	470
Royal Norwegian Government	423
Rural Worker	412
Russian Legation	426
Ryan, Jack	437



	S	Page
Saturday Evening Post.....		461
Schools.....		421
Public.....		422
Public-school systems.....	422,	423
Seco Industrial Co.....		428
September 3, 1947, registration filed by Tass, pursuant to section 2 of Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.....		450
Shanghai municipal police.....		470
Sherman, Alexander.....	419, 421-424,	431
1742 17th Street NW.....		421
Joseph Forer, attorney.....		421
Motion picture distribution for Hoffberg Productions, Brandon Films, Artkino, Contemporary Films.....		421
Operation of Georgetown Theater, 1950-54.....		422
Publicity and film consultant for Royal Norwegian Government, 1942-46.....		423
Publicity work for Columbia Pictures.....		423
Film critic, New York Morning Telegraph.....		423
Sherman, Polly.....	419, 431,	432
Employed at Polish Embassy.....		431
Shields, Esther Lowell.....		461
Shoreham Hotel.....		419
Smedley, Agnes.....	461,	470
Sorge espionage case.....		470
Sotoff, Andrew Ivanovitch.....		470
Sourwine, Mr. Jay.....		437
"Stalin's American Snoops" by Paul F. Healy.....		461
State Department.....	415, 432,	433
Press release, January 15, 1953, re Yuri V. Novikov.....	432,	433
State, Secretary of, press conference.....		413
Statler Hotel.....		419
Stone, Mr. John B.....	416, 417-421	
2901 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.....		417
Joseph Forer, attorney.....		417
Publishes "On the Washington Record".....		417
Publisher of Billings Searchlight, 1922.....		417
Radio editor of Chicago Evening Post, 1923.....		417
Feature writer for Chicago Daily News, 1924-29.....		417
Rewrite man for Chicago Evening American, 1929-30 or 1931.....		417
Public relations in Chicago.....		417
Herald Examiner.....		417
Public relations account executive for the Illinois Central Railroad, for DeKuyper Co.....		417
Came to Washington in 1939 or 1940.....		418
Treasury Department, Procurement, Assistant Director of Public Relations.....		418
OPA.....		418
OWI.....		418
Newsweek magazine, Washington correspondent, 1944-47.....		418
Bridgeport Herald, Washington correspondent.....		418
Public relations, World Congress of Statisticians.....		419
Federated Press.....		419
National Guardian.....		419
Fifth amendment re Communist.....		420
St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.....		422
"Such Is Life" by Jeanne Perkins Harmon.....	437, 438-450	
Chapter 11.....	438-444	
Chapter 12.....	444-450	
Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.....		436
Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.....		436

## T

TASS News Agency.....	413-416, 428-432, 435, 436, 438, 450, 461, 468, 470
"Tass Men Exposed".....	469
Tass, New York Office.....	413, 414
Tass, Washington office.....	414

	Page
Temple University.....	436
Textile Workers Organizing Committee.....	412
Tito.....	438
Todd, Alden.....	431, 432, 435-437
4872 Chevy Chase Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md.....	435
Testimony of.....	435-437
David Cobb, attorney.....	435
News reporter for Federated Press, Feb. 2, 1946.....	435
Son of Larry Todd, ranking Tass Correspondent in Washington for many years.....	435
United States Army, Parachute Infantry.....	435
Employed in Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.....	436
Graduated Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, 1939.....	436
Temple University.....	436
Fifth amendment re Communist.....	436
Todd, Larry.....	414
Washington bureau of Tass.....	414, 429, 435
Treasury Department.....	418
Procurement Division.....	418
Tsvetkov, Ivan V.....	468, 469

## U

United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.....	428, 429
United States.....	326, 429, 432
United States Government.....	411, 412, 415, 418, 420
United States Information Agency.....	467
U. S. Law Week.....	427
U. S. S. R.....	470

## V

Verber, Otto.....	433
"Vivid Picture of Changing China, A".....	461
Voice of China.....	470
Washington.....	412, 413, 416, 418-421, 423-426, 428, 429, 432, 435, 436
Washington Daily News, April 14, 1952.....	468
Washington school system.....	424
Watkins, Senator Arthur V.....	411, 437, 450
Welker, Senator Herman.....	425, 426, 437
Wheeler campaign, Montana.....	417
White, Harry D.....	421
White House.....	413, 415
Wikmen, R. L.....	470
Willoughby, Gen. Charles.....	470
World Congress of Statisticians.....	419
W1'B.....	418
Wright, Archie.....	412

## O







## CONTENTS

---

Testimony of—	Page
Fred Myers-----	471
Gerald W. Rogers-----	493



# SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND  
OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:40 a. m., in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland (chairman) and Jenner.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; and Robert C. McManus, investigations analyst.

Senator JENNER. The committee will come to order.

Will you call the first witness?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers; Fred Myers.

Mr. MYERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Come forward, Mr. Myers, please.

Senator JENNER. Will you be sworn to testify, Mr. Myers? Do you swear that the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MYERS. I do.

Senator JENNER. Will you be seated.

## TESTIMONY OF FRED MYERS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator JENNER. Let me say at the outset that the Internal Security Subcommittee has received testimony from Yuri Rastvorov that VOKS, a Soviet organization that is designed to promote cultural relationships with foreign countries, has been used as a cover for intelligence agents by the Soviet secret police, the MVD.

Mr. Rastvorov also testified that the American-Russian Institute was used for intelligence purposes and for recruiting Americans into the Communist framework. During the course of the investigations of the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Internal Security Subcommittee was able to establish that the American-Russian Institute was created as an affiliate of VOKS.

This witness this morning has been an executive secretary of the American-Russian Institute.

Proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, before beginning, I wonder if we could put some of the evidence supporting the opening statement of the chairman into the record at this time.

Senator JENNER. You may.



Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, would you read the portion of Mr. Rastvorov's testimony that is relevant to the opening statement about VOKS and the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. MANDEL. I read from testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee dated February 8, 1956, by Mr. Yuri A. Rastvorov:

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us about the operation in VOKS?

Mr. RASTVOROV. This organization, they call the cultural relationship with foreign countries, and they have their representation all over the world attached to local embassies.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you continue?

Mr. RASTVOROV. As I mentioned before about Tass, the people who maintain the cultural relationship with foreign countries practically engage in intelligence operations in foreign countries, and it is no different between Tass and the organization by name VOKS.

In other words, in spite of the fact this is official government organization, section of government which tries to maintain a cultural relationship, but practically speaking, the personnel of this organization abroad consists of intelligence people from Military Intelligence Service and from Political Intelligence Service, MVD.

For instance, in Tokyo and in other countries, I knew a couple of people who worked under cover of VOKS doing intelligence, engaged in intelligence activities.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony, Mr. Rastvorov, that you know from your own experience that the organization VOKS, which is the cultural organization of the Soviet Union—

Mr. RASTVOROV. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Which is engaged to bring about cultural relations with other countries, that that, too, is a cover for intelligence operations?

Mr. RASTVOROV. Exactly, that's right.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with an organization called the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. RASTVOROV. I don't know particularly about activities of this organization, but according to my knowledge, I know that this organization was used for intelligence purposes by Intelligence Service in United States, in other words.

Mr. MORRIS. You knew that the American-Russian Institute was used for intelligence purposes?

Mr. RASTVOROV. Yes, exactly. It is one object of Soviet Intelligence Service for recruitment purposes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have had testimony, considerable testimony in the course of the last 4 or 5 years, on the activities in and around the American-Russian Institute.

You don't mean that everybody connected with that would be a Communist; do you?

Mr. RASTVOROV. Not exactly, of course.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean it is an organization that they control. Suppose you tell me. How do they operate it?

Mr. RASTVOROV. Well, I repeat again, this organization such as I mentioned before, is organization which is subject for recruitment, I mean, the people who work in this organization is a subject for recruitment for intelligence purposes of Soviet Intelligence Service.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Mandel.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put into the record at this time an exhibit from the Institute of Pacific Relations hearing which showed the intimate connection between the American-Russian Institute and VOKS at the time of the establishment of the American-Russian Institute.

Will you describe the document, Mr. Mandel?

May it go in, Mr. Chairman?

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Proceed, Mr. Mandel.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a document that was presented from the Insti-

tute of Pacific Relations files in our hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is headed "Comments by Officers of the U. S. S. R. I. P. R. on Present Crisis in the Far East":

Motylev's suggestion for Carter's visit to Moscow, August 10, 1923.

I read a paragraph from that document:

We had a long session at VOX at the invitation of the new President, Smirnov. Motylev, Mrs. Carter, Miss Kislova, and myself were present. Smirnov wanted to know how cooperation between VOX and the American-Russian Institute could be made more effective. He wished to get a very much fuller understanding of the work and program of the A. R. I. and hoped that much more substantial cooperation could be built up in the future. I read between the lines that VOX felt that the A. R. I. gave letters of introduction to VOX to any American tourist who requested one and thus they had no basis for discrimination as to who was entitled to a lot of time and who could best be handled by Intourist. If VOX knew in advance of the specific social opinions and interests of important Americans, they could make very much better use of their limited staff. Smirnov wanted a long explanation as to why the A. R. I. still retained a certain internationally known enemy of the U. S. S. R. on its board of directors.

That is page 3484 of the I. P. R. hearings.

(The exhibit above referred to may be found in part 10 of the published hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you put the citation of the Attorney General with respect to the American-Russian Institute into the record?

Mr. MANDEL. The American-Russian Institute and its branches in New York City and San Francisco were cited as subversive by the Attorney General on May 27, 1948. The branches at Philadelphia and southern California were cited by the Attorney General as subversive on April 21, 1949.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, would you give your full name and address to the reporter?

Mr. MYERS. Fred Myers.

Mr. MORRIS. And where do you reside, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. 4328 Brandywine NW., Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is your occupation?

Mr. MYERS. I am executive director of the National Humane Society.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, would you tell us what the National Humane Society is?

Mr. MYERS. It is a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals and children.

Mr. MORRIS. And what, Mr. Myers? I did not understand the last part.

Mr. MYERS. And children.

Mr. MORRIS. Children. Now, would you tell me the membership, the scope of the membership, of that organization?

Mr. MYERS. It has a relatively small membership which is national in distribution.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, for how long have you been so engaged?

Mr. MYERS. Since November 1954.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Myers, do you hold a college degree?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your first employment, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. You mean, why back?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the first significant employment. You are basically a journalist and an editor, are you not?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

My first newspaper employment was as a reporter for the Kansas City Journal.

Mr. MORRIS. And what year was that?

Mr. MYERS. I believe 1923.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your next employment?

Mr. MYERS. I was next employed with the United Press.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year?

Mr. MYERS. I am not absolutely sure of the year, but I believe 1931.

Mr. MORRIS. After that?

Mr. MYERS. From the United Press, I went to the New York Mirror.

Mr. MORRIS. When were you employed by the New York Mirror?

Mr. MYERS. 1934, I think, to 1937.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you the chairman of the New York Daily Mirror unit of the New York Newspaper Guild?

Mr. MYERS. For a time I was.

Mr. MORRIS. What period of time was that?

Mr. MYERS. Approximately 1935 to 1937.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to read into the record the testimony of Mr. Clayton Knowles, a New York Times newspaperman, who has testified. This is executive session testimony taken October 6, 1955. The witness is Clayton Knowles, now a New York Times reporter.

Mr. Knowles has testified at this point in the transcript that he had been a member of the Communist Party:

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you or did you know Fred Myer?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, I did, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was Fred Myer?

Mr. KNOWLES. Fred Myer, I believe, was chairman of the Daily Mirror unit. He later became an organizer for the American Newspaper Guild.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was chairman of the Daily Mirror unit of the Newspaper Guild?

Mr. KNOWLES. Correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any information as to whether Fred Myer is or was a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, sir. He was a man who invited me—he was the man who approached me at St. Louis and invited me to attend that meeting that I told you about.

Mr. SOURWINE. The first person who asked you to join the Communist Party?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, he was not the first person. He was the person at St. Louis who said, "Would you like to come around and hear a summary of what went on here, an analysis of the effectiveness of this convention?"

Mr. SOURWINE. And you knew him to be a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not then, but he later—it was he who disclosed when he got there that this was a Communist meeting.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where he is now?

Mr. KNOWLES. No, sir; I have no idea.

Now, Mr. Myers, we would like to ask you a few questions about that particular testimony.

Do you remember attending the St. Louis convention?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. At that time, what position did you have in the Newspaper Guild?

Mr. MYERS. I was chairman of the Mirror unit.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Now, were you then the editor of the Guild Reporter?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. You were not. You became that later; is that it?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the year of that convention, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. I may be wrong. I think it was 1935.

Mr. MORRIS 1935.

Now, did you attend a Communist caucus at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was in control of the Newspaper Guild at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I beg your pardon?

Mr. MORRIS. Who was in control of the Newspaper Guild at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I don't know how to answer that question. It was governed by a board of directors.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

There were dominant personalities, were there not, in the guild at that time, and you knew them personally?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, yes; there were outstanding people in it.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us who they were, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. Well, the executive secretary was Milton Kaufman.

Mr. MORRIS. Milton Kaufman, Mr. Chairman, has been a witness before this committee, and he has been identified in sworn testimony as having been a member of the Communist Party.

Who else, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. I may have given Mr. Kaufman's title incorrectly, because I believe that another man was known as secretary-treasurer, Victor Pasch.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Victor Pasch has been identified in testimony before this committee as having been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MYERS. Perhaps, and really undoubtedly, most noted of all was Heywood Broun, who was president.

I don't—

Mr. MORRIS. Well, what was your relationship to the guild at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I had no relationship, except that I was chairman of a newspaper unit. That was my first convention, and I really knew no more about the guild than other people who were attending at that time. I had been in it only about 6 months.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were there two factions in the guild at that time, to your knowledge?

Mr. MYERS. I think there were several factions.

Mr. MORRIS. Was there a slate that was dominated by people who were accused of being Communists and a slate dominated by those who were making the accusations that the dominant slate were Communists?

Mr. MYERS. Yes. As you say, that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, with respect to each of those two factions, with which faction were you at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I was alined with the faction which was accused of being Communist-led.



Mr. MORRIS. You were working with that.

Now, can you recall Clayton Knowles at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I have no memory of Mr. Knowles at all.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you recall attending a session which Clayton Knowles described here in this sworn testimony?

Mr. MYERS. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not?

Mr. MYERS. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony that you were a Communist at that time?

Mr. MYERS. That I was not a Communist at that time.

Mr. MORRIS. It is your testimony that you were not a Communist at that time?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you are telling this subcommittee that the testimony given by Clayton Knowles is not accurate testimony with respect to you?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

As you know, in executive session I stated the same thing and gave my opinion of how Mr. Knowles might have arrived at such an impression.

Mr. MORRIS. What was that?

Mr. MYERS. Well, as I have just told you, I did align myself in the internal politics of the American Newspaper Guild with a group which was accused of being Communist-led.

Mr. MORRIS. And you have no doubt that they were Communist-led at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I have no doubt that there were strong Communist influences within that group. I have no doubt of that. I had none at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. You had none at the time?

Mr. MYERS. That is right. Because I was strongly of the opinion that the cause that the guild espoused was good, I thought it expedient and good to work with whoever would ally himself in that cause. I quite freely worked with people whom I thought to be or suspected of being Communists.

At the St. Louis convention, which was the first that I ever attended, there were caucuses, I think, six times a day all over the place. You could hardly move up and down the corridor or walk up and down the aisle without somebody inviting you to a meeting in somebody's room or in a special conference room. It is quite possible, because I was active in that convention, that I invited Mr. Knowles, as I am sure numbers of other people, to various meetings all during the week-long convention.

I have already testified twice to this committee that not to my knowledge did I attend any meeting of a Communist fraction or group or cell or any other thing Communist.

Chairman EASTLAND (now presiding). Do you deny that you attempted to recruit Mr. Knowles into the Communist Party?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, you stayed on with this particular group that you have just described for some time thereafter; did you not?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. In fact, you became the editor of their publication; did you not?

Mr. MYERS. It was not their publication. It was the guild's.

Mr. MORRIS. The publication of the guild which they dominated?

Mr. MYERS. Right.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is the name of that publication?

Mr. MYERS. The Guild Reporter.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, how long were you editor of the Guild Reporter?

Mr. MYERS. I believe only slightly more than 1 year.

Mr. MORRIS. What year was that?

Mr. MYERS. 1939, running into 1940.

Chairman EASTLAND. Now, you stated there were two factions. You state that one of those factions had strong Communist tendencies, to your knowledge; is that correct?

Mr. MYERS. It was my opinion that that was so.

Chairman EASTLAND. Yes; and that you affiliated with that faction?

Mr. MYERS. Senator, I didn't use the word "affiliated." I worked with them.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right. You worked with them. You promoted them; did you not?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I guess so.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right. Now, why did you do that?

Mr. MYERS. Because I very strongly believed that it was the desirable thing that the American Newspaper Guild should be organized and become effective.

Chairman EASTLAND. And you did not think it could become effective under the control of anti-Communists; is that what you say?

Mr. MYERS. At the minute, the Newspaper Guild was under the leadership of the people whom I found there.

I might say, I had a very strong affection for and an intense admiration for Heywood Brown, and I—

Chairman EASTLAND. But you did not think the guild could become more effective if led by anti-Communists, and therefore you affiliated with the Communist group; is that the meaning of what you say?

Mr. MYERS. But not because it was Communist and not with prime relevance to whether it was Communist, Senator. My point was that they were active and effective organizers—

Chairman EASTLAND. All right.

There were two factions, you said. The facts are that one of them was a Communist faction, and you say with strong Communist influences. Now, we will accept what you say. And you affiliated with them.

Mr. MYERS. Senator—

Chairman EASTLAND. Do you not think it could have been more effective with non-Communists at its head?

Mr. MYERS. Not at that moment. I believe that the Newspaper Guild as of now is much more effective without Communist influence than it would be had that influence continued.

Chairman EASTLAND. Don't you know that the Communist ruin any organization that they take over?

Mr. MYERS. Senator, you will have to allow me, please, to go back to 1935. I had never in my life had the slightest experience with a trade union or with a Communist or with a Socialist or with any-

thing political of any type. I was a newspaperman and had been for a good many years.

Chairman EASTLAND. You think that the Communist Party is just a political party?

Mr. MYERS. At this point? No; by no means, no. But in 1930—

Chairman EASTLAND. Then why did you affiliate with them?

Mr. MYERS. I didn't affiliate with the Communist Party.

Chairman EASTLAND. Well, you affiliated with a group that they controlled and was pure communism that was trying to take over an organization to make it an instrumentality of communism.

Mr. MYERS. No, Senator. There were a good many people active in the work in the guild who were not Communists and who were strong people.

Chairman EASTLAND. I know. But you deliberately affiliated with the Communist side of that organization.

Mr. MYERS. Not with the Communist side. I am sorry. I don't mean to be disputatious. I am trying to explain what motivated me at that time. I was not affiliating with nor supporting nor in any other way promoting communism.

Chairman EASTLAND. How could you affiliate with them and promote the Communist side and not promote communism?

Mr. MYERS. My objective was to use the tools that were at hand to organize the guild.

Chairman EASTLAND. Yes. But you had a very powerful anti-Communist side of it that finally won, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly not in 1935. In fact, I don't believe there was any election contest at the 1935 convention.

Mr. MORRIS. The fact remains that they prevailed many years thereafter, does it not, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. And you were a supporter of that group?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Then, Mr. Myers, furthermore, you became an editor of their publication, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. I did, but not with the connotation that you are—

Chairman EASTLAND. And you aided the Communist group to stay in control, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. Not a Communist group.

Chairman EASTLAND. Sir?

Mr. MYERS. I did not aid a Communist group.

Chairman EASTLAND. All right. A group that had strong Communist influences. You aided that group in staying in control for many years, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. I would state it myself that I thought it was unwise for the guild to change leadership in the middle of a battle.

Chairman EASTLAND. But you aided that group to stay in control. Now, answer my question yes or no.

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Chairman EASTLAND. You did. And even though you say you never belonged to the Communist Party, you were a fellow traveler, you say?

Mr. MYERS. No; I don't say that.

Chairman EASTLAND. What?

Mr. MYERS. No; I don't say that.

Chairman EASTLAND. That means it. You cooperated with, and you aided and promoted the Communist faction in the guild.

Mr. MYERS. No, sir; I did not, and I was not a fellow traveler.

Chairman EASTLAND. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, the Guild Reporter that the committee has on file here indicates that you were its editor as late as 1941. You testified here that you were the editor for a short time in 1940.

Mr. MYERS. I accept the correction. I was not sure of the year.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I notice, Mr. Myers, that during the period that you were editor, there was an item on February 1, 1941, that supported the American Peace Mobilization. That was at the time during the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

Mr. MYERS. I don't recall any such article.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not recall that. The Guild Reporter on May 1, 1941, carried an attack on a gentleman named Nathaniel Honig for testimony against Harry Bridges.

Mr. MYERS. You are asking me if I recall it? No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you say that during the period that you were the editor of that particular newspaper, that it followed the Communist Party line?

Mr. MYERS. I certainly would say not.

Mr. MORRIS. You say it did not?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what did you do after you left the Guild Reporter? What was your next employment?

Mr. MYERS. I was employed as public relations director of the American Society for Russian Relief, which was a unit of the National War Fund.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us about that?

Mr. MYERS. Well, it was like all other war relief organizations of that period. It raised money to buy medical supplies, clothing, certain food supplies. It operated under the supervision of the President's War Relief Control Board. It was closely supervised by several other Government agencies because of the necessity of obtaining purchase priority and shipping priority for the shipment of supplies.

During the period that I was connected with the organization, we—

Mr. MORRIS. You have not told us the exact date, have you, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. 1941 to August 1946.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us exactly in what month in 1941 you left the Guild Reporter?

Mr. MYERS. No, sir; I cannot.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may these articles that we referred to in the Guild Reporter which were published at the time in the paper and bore the masthead of Fred Myers, editor, go into the record at this time?

Chairman EASTLAND. They will be admitted.



(The articles referred to were marked "Exhibit No. 176 and 176-A." and are as follows:)

# EXHIBIT No. 176

[The Guild Reporter, May 1, 1941]

## EX-RED GUILDSMAN STRIKES AT BRIDGES

SAN FRANCISCO (FP).—The first witness in 3 weeks of testimony to make an unequivocal charge of Communist Party membership against President Harry Bridges of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (CIO) was Nat Honig, a Seattle Hearst newspaperman and former Communist.

Honig testified before Examiner Charles B. Sears in the deportation hearing that he had seen Bridges at "top fraction" meetings in San Francisco.

Cross examination brought out two interesting facts about Honig, who was editor of the Timber Worker until former president Harold Pritchett of the International Woodworkers (CIO) fired him.

First, Honig was picked up by detectives in March, when he walked out of a Seattle department store with books under his arm, but was released when he agreed to pay for them. After this incident Honig, who since November had refused the FBI's request that he testify against Bridges, changed his mind and decided to talk.

He insisted that no threats had been made. The reason, he explained, was that he had been reading the back files of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and found that the FBI was "not antilabor" as he once suspected. Honig is employed by the Post-Intelligencer as a part-time copyreader.

Second, it was shown that in 1933 Honig was a witness in the case of the Chatham Shoe Co. against the Shoeworkers Industrial Union. He testified then that the Trade Union Unity League was not affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions, but in the current hearing he has sworn to just the opposite.

Although Honig was able to remember and name many CIO officials whom he believes to be Communists, he was vague when asked where the so-called top fraction meetings were held. In no case could he give an address. "It was a party rule that immediately we reached the meeting place, we forgot the address," he explained.

Honig also testified that Victor Pasche, secretary-treasurer of the ANG, is a Communist.

Mention of Pasche arose in connection with testimony by Honig, in response to a question, that he had no proof that George Wilson, an ANG vice president and chairman of the Bridges Defense committee, is a Communist.

Defense counsel asked Honig whether he had ever sought to induce Pasche to give him fraudulent job references to help him obtain employment in Seattle. The question referred to a letter Honig wrote to Pasche some time ago, asking Pasche to give to or obtain for him, such a letter. Honig denied that he had done so.

Then Chief Prosecutor Albert der Guercio asked:

"The name of Victor Pasche has been brought out here. Who is he?"

"He is secretary of the American Newspaper Guild," Honig replied.

"Is he also a member of the Communist Party?"

"To my knowledge he is."

Comment of Pasche on the testimony was:

"Obviously he is willing to bear false witness against me as readily as he has been doing against Harry Bridges and almost everybody in the west coast and Pacific Northwest labor movement who stands for strong trade unionism. The reason for the attack on me appears in the record of the hearing. Calling the secretary of the ANG a Communist is Honig's convenient way of meeting the simple fact that some time before landing on the P-I, when he was still trying to get his first regular newspaper job on a Seattle daily, he wrote and asked the same secretary to procure him faked references crediting him with experience on New York dailies. That is a very pertinent fact bearing on his credibility in the Bridges' hearing."

Honig has a long history of red-baiting of officers of many unions. In 1940 he led an attack in the Seattle Guild upon delegates to the Memphis convention, including Robert Camozzi, former ANG vice president, and Cliff Erickson, former P-I striker, accusing them of being Communists.

At approximately the same time he declared in a Guild meeting that almost the entire leadership of the northwest labor movement was Communist, includ-

ing A. E. Harding, president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific; J. F. Jurich, president, and George Lane, secretary-treasurer of the Fishermen's International union, and Harold Pritchett, then IWA president.

Honig also appeared in hearings during a fight in the IWA in January 1941, testifying that O. M. Orton, president, and Bertil McCarty, secretary-treasurer, were Communists.

He ran for secretary of the Seattle Guild with a "united Guild" slate, but lost to Marie Pearl while all others on his slate won.

---

#### EXHIBIT No. 176-A

[The Guild Reporter, February 1, 1941]

#### PEACE MEET ASKS HELP OF GUILD

WASHINGTON.—Enlistment of volunteers from the American Newspaper Guild to aid in publicizing the antiwar campaign of the American Peace Mobilization was suggested at the working conference for peace, attended by representatives of 64 CIO and 13 AFL unions, here last weekend.

The press and radio committee of the conference, in its report to the general session, urged that the conference formally request the Guild to bring the proposal before its member writers. The committee urged an enlarged publicity department of volunteers built around one full-time paid employee.

"Nobody will question the proposition that vast publicity for our opposition to H. R. 1776 will be needed to offset the vast publicity which those in favor of the bill have at their command and are already using on a colossal scale," the report said.

A conference meeting of 1,000 voiced the demand that House and Senate committees continue public hearings on the lend-lease bill until representatives of organized labor and other people's groups are given the opportunity to testify.

Mr. MORRIS. How many people were active in the preparation of the Guild Reporter at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Just I, except that, of course, there was consultation with other people among the Guild officers.

Mr. MORRIS. And you then were responsible for the articles that appeared in the paper, were you not?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

But I want it to be understood that I was an employee.

Mr. MORRIS. I understand. But it is your testimony that you do not know the exact month that you became active in this other organization?

Mr. MYERS. In which? The American Society for Russian Relief?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. No, I don't know the—

Mr. MORRIS. It must have been after June 22, 1941: is that right?

Mr. MYERS. I believe so, but I don't know so.

Mr. MORRIS. I mean, the organization was not in being during the Hitler-Stalin Pact, because at that time the Soviet Union was allied with the Germans?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, it certainly came into being after the Soviet Union was involved in war.

Mr. MORRIS. And it is your testimony that you left the Guild Reporter and went directly to this other organization?

Mr. MYERS. No. I was unemployed for perhaps 60 days.

Mr. MORRIS. Sixty days?

Mr. MYERS. I don't know exactly, but approximately.

Mr. MORRIS. All right. What was your next employment after that?

Mr. MYERS. After the American Society for Russian Relief, I became executive director of the American-Russian Institute in New York City.

Mr. MORRIS. And that is the organization that is the subject of this hearing today, Mr. Myers.

Mr. MYERS. Is it permissible for me to intervene a statement at this point?

Mr. MORRIS. He wants to submit a statement.

Mr. MYERS. No. I don't mean an extensive statement.

Mr. MORRIS. By all means.

Chairman EASTLAND. Oh, surely.

Mr. MYERS. Just as a matter of fact, the testimony or documentary evidence which was read into the record, or the statement which was made at the beginning of this hearing, as I understood it, would seem to indicate that the American-Russian Institute in New York City has some connection with organizations of similar name elsewhere in the country.

I merely want to state that there was no connection, that I had, as executive director of the organization in New York, not only no authority but no contact with and no knowledge of any organization of similar name anywhere else in the country.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what were the duties of the executive director?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I was engaged for this job before I left the American Society for Russian Relief, by W. W. Lancaster, who is a senior partner of the rather eminent New York law firm of Sherman, Sterling, and Wright, and by Ellsworth Bunker, who was then chairman of several large sugar companies, and subsequently has been American Ambassador to at least one South American country, and who I believe is now chairman of the American Red Cross, or president, and their concern, as they expressed it to me in the conversations which led me to accept the job, was that there should be, following the demise of the American Society for Russian Relief, the dissolution of which was already planned, a continuation of what we thought was a hopeful possibility of maintaining what we then thought were good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The American-Russian Institute had been, up till that time, a very small thing. It owned a small building in New York City and a rather valuable, although small, library. But although I had known nothing about it prior to that time, my impression was that it had been virtually inactive and had been pretty meaningless.

Mr. Bunker and Mr. Lancaster were on the board of directors of the institute, and they thought that I would be capable of building the membership of the institute and its financial support and of making it useful as a bridge between scholars and students of the two countries.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, may I break in there, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Harriet Moore active in the organization at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Who?

Mr. MORRIS. Harriet Moore.

Mr. MYERS. I believe that she was a director.

Mr. MORRIS. She was also the editor, was she not, of its publication?



Mr. MYERS. I am not sure of that, and I don't believe that the institute had a regular publication.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Myers, do you know that Harriet Moore preceded you as executive secretary of that organization?

Mr. MYERS. I knew she had that title, yes. But she was an unpaid and purely part-time volunteer.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know that she bore the title of executive secretary?

Mr. MYERS. That is right. The institute, up to the time that I went to it, had no full-time executive.

Mr. MORRIS. I have a letterhead of that organization here, Mr. Myers, dated July 14, 1938, which indicates that Harriet Moore at that time was the editor of the American-Russian Institute.

Mr. MYERS. I know nothing about that.

Mr. MORRIS. And she was also a member of the board of directors, was she not?

Mr. MYERS. She was.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you first meet Harriet Moore?

Mr. MYERS. She was also a director of the American Society for Russian Relief, and I met her for the first time in about 1942, I guess.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have had three witnesses identify Harriet Moore as a person who was at that time a member of the Communist Party. In addition, we have subpoenaed Harriet Moore, who is now known as Harriet Moore Gelfan, and asked her about this testimony, and she invoked her privilege under the fifth amendment rather than enter a denial on the record.

Now, a successor of yours as executive director of the American-Russian Institute was Henry H. Collins, Jr., was he not, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. I believe that is the name.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Henry Collins?

Mr. MYERS. I met him, but only casually after I left the institute. I was introduced to him, but I don't really know him at all.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Henry H. Collins, Jr., was, according to the testimony given by witnesses before this committee, a member of the original Harold Ware cell of the Communist Party and was active in the Communist Party for many years, and when we asked him about this evidence he took refuge under the fifth amendment rather than testify.

Mr. MYERS. I would like, if I may, to bring out that I was connected with the American-Russian Institute only about 2 or 3 months. Again I am not sure of the time, but it was a very short period.

Mr. MORRIS. You received for your work, did you not, the Order of the Red Banner from President Kalinin of the Supreme Soviet, did you not, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I did. But it was stated in the citation that it was in recognition of the work of several million Americans.

Mr. MORRIS. You received that citation August 29, 1945, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. I don't know the exact date, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put into the record a news item from the New York Times of Wednesday, August 29, 1945, page 8.

Mr. Mandel, will you read that into the record, please?

Mr. MANDEL. I read a portion of the article:



## RUSSIAN AID CHIEF GETS SOVIET HONOR

CARTER IN MOSCOW AFTER TRIP OF INSPECTION SAYS AMERICAN RELIEF NEED CONTINUES

(By Brooks Atkinson)

Moscow, August 28, 1945.—Edward C. Carter, of New York, president of the American Society for Russian Relief here, received the award of the Order of the Red Banner of Labor from President Mikhail I. Kalinin in the council room of the Supreme Soviet today as a symbol of "friendship between our two countries and acknowledgment of material aid from private citizens of the United States to the workers and peasants of the U. S. S. R."

An identical order will be given to Fred Myers, executive director of the Russian Relief, who is in the United States \* \* \*

Mr. Carter concluded his visit of three weeks in Russia \* \* \* He is taking off tomorrow for London, where he will attend to affairs of the Institute of Pacific Relations of which he is permanent secretary general.

The full article is here.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 177" and is as follows:)

## EXHIBIT No. 177

[New York Times, August 29, 1945, p. 8]

## RUSSIAN AID CHIEF GETS SOVIETS HONOR

CARTER IN MOSCOW AFTER TRIP ON INSPECTION SAYS AMERICAN RELIEF NEED CONTINUES

(By Brooks Atkinson)

By Wireless to the New York Times

Moscow, August 28.—Edward C. Carter, of New York, president of the American Society for Russian Relief here, received the award of the Order of the Red Banner of Labor from President Mikhail I. Kalinin in the council room of the Supreme Soviet today as a symbol of "friendship between our two countries and acknowledgement of material aid from private citizens of the United States to the workers and peasants of the U. S. S. R."

An identical order will be given to Fred Myers, executive director of the Russian Relief, who is in the United States. David Weingard, supply officer for the Russian Relief, and Leo Gruliov, Moscow representative of the society, received the Soviet Union's Labor Distinction Medal.

Mr. Carter concluded his visit of 3 weeks in Russia with an inspection trip to the Donbas region. He is taking off tomorrow for London, where he will attend to affairs of the Institute of Pacific Relations of which he is permanent secretary general.

As a result of his survey of the current needs of Russia, Mr. Carter announced that the American Society for Russian Relief would continue its work for a year from the coming October, when the situation will again be examined. Before he left the United States local committees throughout the country voted overwhelmingly in favor of continuing relief if there was unequivocal evidence that it was needed. Mr. Carter reports that he found ample evidence that the need would exist for a long time.

"I do not think one 5-year plan is going to restore Russia to the condition as it was in 1941," he said. "Great sections of the U. S. S. R. are going to have short pickings for a long time."

Apart from that Mr. Carter added. "One of the byproducts of our aid is a little better feeling between the citizens of the 2 countries; the contribution of \$54 million worth of material is small in comparison with the good done."

He hopes to persuade American hospitals, children's homes, trade unions and community organizations to adopt opposite numbers in Russia to stimulate personal interest in particular Russian projects, in contrast to the mass relief that was the only kind possible under war conditions. In addition, the Russians have asked for certain cultural aid—school classroom material, books in English, scientific books and the like.

From its receipts in money and supplies of a total value of \$54 million the American Society for Russian Relief has already delivered about \$47 million, worth of materials to Russia. The rest is either en route now or in warehouses in the

United States awaiting transport in Russian ships that will call at Atlantic ports.

Mr. Carter visited Stalino, Voroshilovsk and other cities in the Donbas region that had been almost destroyed by the Germans. The people there, he said, seemed aware that this material was not lend-lease, but voluntary contributions from private sources. In the Voroshilovsk area 517,000 persons had received Russian Relief material.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, is it your testimony that even though you were the executive director of this organization, you were not its principal officer, or principal working officer?

Mr. MYERS. Of the American Society for Russian Relief?

Mr. MORRIS. No; American-Russian Institute.

Mr. MYERS. During the time I was there, I was its principal working officer, but I was definitely not in control.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. You were not in control. In other words, you just performed the work given to you by the board; is that it?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; and the board's chief assignment to me was to raise some money, which I didn't succeed in doing.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, to your knowledge, then, who was the principal officer who gave direction to the workers of the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I believe that it was Mr. Lancaster, because at that time, I believe, he was chairman of the board.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you aware that the Attorney General has cited the American-Russian Institute as a Communist organization?

Mr. MYERS. Yes. Of course, that was long after I left it.

Mr. MORRIS. I mean, it may have been cited long after, but it was cited on the basis of its activity, which included the activity of the American-Russian Institute while you were the executive director, was it not, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I have not any knowledge that it was on the basis of anything that happened while I was its executive director, and I would certainly doubt that.

Mr. MORRIS. You know, Mr. Myers, that the Attorney General cited it at a later time. It must have been on the basis of its performance through the years.

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. And the mere date of the citation would be only important to show what date the Attorney General got around to putting it on that particular list. Don't you think that is the significance of it?

Mr. MYERS. I think not, Judge Morris, although it is presumptuous of me to dispute with you what legal significance is. But you have yourself brought out here this morning a statement that after I left the American-Russian Institute, among my successors was a man who has been testified to be or to have been a Communist. Is it not equally to be assumed that the Attorney General acted on the basis of such a thing as that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. I say, on the basis of all of its activity, not activity only that was going on at the time of the citation.

Mr. MYERS. It is just that you asked me to agree to a statement that the Attorney General cited the institute because of something that happened while I was there, and that I couldn't agree to.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, you also did public-relations work for the Institute of Pacific Relations; did you not?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Then you acted as public-relations counselor on individual occasions for Mr. Carter of that organization, did you not?

Mr. MYERS. I was a friend of Mr. Carter's, and he talked to me occasionally, but I certainly was no public-relations consultant for the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember when Alfred Kohlberg brought charges against the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MYERS. Yes, I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't you have an assignment in connection with Mr. Kohlberg's charges at that time?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't you do some public relations work for Mr. Carter at that time?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. To state Mr. Carter's position with regard to his fight with Mr. Kohlberg?

Mr. MYERS. I don't recall every conversation that I ever had with Mr. Carter, but if you could state more precisely what you mean by "public relations work" I will answer "Yes" or "No," but nothing that I would call public relations work.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you go to the Soviet Union at all in connection with this work?

Mr. MYERS. I did.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you go?

Mr. MYERS. In 1946, the summer of 1946.

Mr. MORRIS. And in what capacity did you go there at that time?

Mr. MYERS. I was still executive director of the society, although I had informed the board that I would resign effective September 11.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, do we have any newspaper clippings reporting the activities of Mr. Myers in the Soviet Union at that time?

Mr. MANDEL. We have here a clipping from the New York Times of August 16, 1946, page 2, which described a committee of delegates of Russian War Relief, Inc., who returned from a tour of the Soviet Union: "In an interview yesterday at the organization's headquarters, 5 Cedar Street, at which members testified to the need of the Russians for housing, clothing, medical supplies and equipment, Fred Myers, executive director of the organization, said Russian housing was in a state of disrepair, and told of a marked shortage of clothing," et cetera.

"The delegation visited Leningrad, Moscow, Minsk, Stalingrad, and Tbilisi, capital of the Georgian Republic."

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge are they accurate reports, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. That is accurate.

(The article above referred to was marked "Exhibit 178" and is as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 178

[New York Times, August 16, 1946, p. 2]

#### AMERICAN RELIEF WORKERS TELL OF CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA

A committee of delegates of Russian War Relief, Inc., who have returned from a tour of the Soviet Union, gave an interview yesterday at the organization's headquarters, 5 Cedar Street, at which members testified to the need of the Russians for housing, clothing, medical supplies and equipment.



Fred Myers, executive director of the organization, said Russian housing was in a state of disrepair and told of a marked shortage of clothing. Dr. Edward L. Young, of Boston, stressed the need for artificial limbs for Russians incapacitated in the war as well as for special equipment required to adjust such aids. Dr. Young said Russian hospitals had adequate staffs but were equipped inadequately or had obsolete working material.

The delegation visited Leningrad, Moscow, Minsk, Stalingrad, and Tbilisi, capital of the Georgian Republic.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what was your next employment after you left the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. MYERS. I believe that I was unemployed for some time. The period of time eludes me. I did some writing, magazine writing.

Mr. MORRIS. For what magazine?

Mr. MYERS. Chiefly for Readers Scope.

Mr. MORRIS. What was Readers Scope?

Mr. MYERS. It was a digest-size magazine of general content.

Mr. MORRIS. How much writing did you do for that publication?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, over a period of perhaps a year, perhaps 15 articles.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Was that publication a publication that was orientated along Communist lines?

Mr. MYERS. Not at all, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, do we have any citations whatever with respect to the Readers Scope?

Mr. MANDEL. The California Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of 1948 on page 225 refers to Readers Scope as among publications which the committee found to be Communist initiated and controlled or so strongly influenced as to be in the Stalin solar system.

Mr. MORRIS. You would disagree with that characterization, would you not?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your next employment, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. I did various small free-lance things to make a living. My next regular employment was with the American Humane Association, in Albany, N. Y.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't you work for the New York Central for a short time?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, yes. I am sorry. It was such a brief time that it—

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I understand, Mr. Myers. It was of short duration.

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And we have every reason to believe that when the New York Central discovered that you had been associated with the American-Russian Institute and had not told them about that particular employment, that they asked for your resignation.

Mr. MYERS. I had told them about such employment, and it was not the discovery which led to the severance of my relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us about that particular episode, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Will you permit me, Judge Morris, to cover that a bit fully, because—

Mr. MORRIS. By all means.

Senator JENNER (presiding). Yes.



MR. MYERS. The best statement available of the circumstances of the incident to which you refer has been provided by Raymond F. Blosser, who at that time was publicity director of the New York Central Railroad, which was the post second in authority in the public relations department of the New York Central Railroad. Mr. Blosser subsequently became the public relations director of the New York Central.

The statement from Mr. Blosser which I would like to read to you was not solicited by me but by another person not particularly a friend of mine who had heard rumors of this kind of thing, and who was seeking the facts about my background. And Mr. Blosser wrote to this person, quite unknown to me, this letter:

I am very sorry to hear that Fred Myers is being attacked on that old New York Central story as you describe it in your letter and that it is being used against him. In view of the fact that I was manager of the Central's press bureau from 1947 to 1951, and the railroad's manager of public relations from 1951 to 1954, I feel I have an obligation to explain the circumstances of Mr. Myers' connection with the Central.

Mr. Myers, who was not previously known to us personally, worked for the Central for about 6 weeks around June 1948. He was employed to fill the position of public relations representative at Cleveland after an orientation period at New York headquarters. His work proved highly satisfactory, and he was well liked by those with whom he came in contact at New York Central.

Before employing Mr. Myers we made what we felt was a thorough check, having in mind that his background had been controversial. In disputes between rival groups for control of the American Newspaper Guild and its general policies, he had been called a fellow traveler because of his identification with one group, and during World War II he had held executive positions with the American Society for Russian War Relief. Although I write from memory, I believe this is the organization's title. Its two top officers had been the late Allen Wardwell, of the eminent and conservative law firm of Davis, Pope, Reid & Wardwell, and Henry Alexander, then a vice president and now president of J. P. Morgan, Inc.

At the time of Mr. Myers' connection with the society, it had been noncontroversial because it was assisting one of our most active war allies. By 1948, when Mr. Myers came to us on the recommendation of a respected mutual friend who happened to be a neighbor of Mr. Myers, the temper of the country had changed so that anything which had been connected with Russia seemed to have become controversial.

I asked Wardwell, one of several persons I checked before we employed Mr. Myers, "Is Myers a Communist?"

"No," declared Wardwell. "He is no more a Communist than I am, and Henry Alexander will tell you the same thing."

When Mr. Myers had completed his orientation period and was about to go to Cleveland, the Central issued the customary press release, which I had arranged, and which I edited before leaving on a vacation trip to the Far West. The announcement included frank references to Mr. Myers' previous connections with the Newspaper Guild and the war relief organization and caused no excitement among newspapers generally or within the Central.

But Mr. Myers apparently had an enemy on a weekly newspaper published in your area. This enemy apparently called the press release to the attention of someone on the New York World-Telegram, which then published a front-page story headlined something like "Fellow Traveler Takes a Ride on the New York Central."

Another Scripps-Howard newspaper, the Cleveland Press, subsequently printed a portion of the World-Telegram story. No other New York or Cleveland newspaper wrote anything on the subject and to the best of my knowledge there was no other newspaper story except for one in the Westchester County weekly.

The World-Telegram article concerned itself with Mr. Myers' employment background, which was no secret, and which he himself had supplied when requesting a job. By its tone and words, the story implied that the Central had been duped by a man who at the least was a fellow traveler, whereas the facts were that the Central, before hiring Mr. Myers, had satisfied itself, if not the World-Telegram, which we had not considered consulting, that Mr. Myers was controversial but clean. The Central was not called for comment before publication.

When the story appeared, I was on vacation in Portland, Oreg. When I returned, my superior, C. R. Dugan, who had, with me, been responsible for the employment of Mr. Myers, told me he had decided immediately that publication of the story automatically ended Mr. Myers' usefulness to the Central, since he felt that the railroad should not be involved in needless controversy, particularly with a newspaper whose good will the Central valued.

There was an additional point that, had Mr. Myers remained with the Central, his work might have been judged by company executives, human nature being what it is, on the basis of suspicions engendered by the World-Telegram's story, rather than on his abilities.

Mr. MORRIS. Just a minute, Mr. Myers. It is not your contention that the World-Telegram story was not an accurate story, is it?

Mr. MYERS. No. But may I finish? There is one more paragraph.

Mr. MORRIS. Go ahead.

Mr. MYERS (continuing):

Without inviting or permitting any explanation from Mr. Myers, Mr. Dugan told Mr. Myers he had no knowledge or concern with the truth or falsity of the World-Telegram's story, but that he felt publication of the article and headline had ended Mr. Myers' usefulness to the Central and accordingly was requesting Mr. Myers' immediate resignation, which he received. The story was published about 3 o'clock one afternoon, and this took place the following morning.

In brief, Mr. Myers was discharged by New York Central after about 6 weeks with the railroad, because publication of the New York World-Telegram story involved the Central in a controversy, and not because anyone at the Central believed Mr. Myers was a Communist. Subsequently, at Mr. Dugan's request, the Central's police department checked with the FBI on the matter and led us to believe the FBI had no evidence justifying doubts as to Mr. Myers' loyalty.

I wanted to make the point perfectly clear that I have not at any time in any employment concealed anything about my career or my personal activities. I have nothing I am ashamed of.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Myers, you do not deny the factual report that appeared in those two stories, do you?

Mr. MYERS. The chronological facts are correct. The implication is what is erroneous.

Mr. MORRIS. It is the interpretation?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do you deny at this time that the American-Russian Institute, of which you were an executive director, was a Communist-controlled organization?

Mr. MYERS. At the time I was there, it certainly was not.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may these two articles referred to by Mr. Myers in the New York World-Telegram, dated July 21, 1948, and July 19, 1948, go into the record.

Senator JENNER. They may go into the record.

(The articles referred to were marked "Exhibit No. 179 and No. 179-A" and are as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 179

[New York World-Telegram, July 19, 1948]

#### FELLOW TRAVELER TAKES THE NEW YORK CENTRAL

A fellow traveler turned up today as an employee of that great travel organization—the New York Central Railroad.

The Central, in a sedate announcement to financial departments, said it had hired Fred Meyers as head of its public relations department with headquarters in Cleveland.

Investigation by the World-Telegram revealed that Mr. Myers is a left-wing newspaperman and editor who 2 years ago was elected executive director of the

American Russian Institute, listed by Attorney General Tom Clark as a subversive organization.

Mr. Myers, who will replace James R. Brugger, was formerly editor of the American Newspaper Guild's publication, the Guild Reporter, at the time the guild was under leftwing control.

It was while he was editor that a minority report to the 1941 guild convention asserted that the paper no longer represented the guild but "is concerned definitely with the promulgation of the Communist Party line."

Mr. Myers served as publicity chief for the Russian War Relief during the war and in its concluding stages was executive director. He was honored by the Russian Government with a medal, the order of the Red Banner.

Immediately prior to his appointment to the New York Central post, Mr. Myers was connected with the left-wing magazine Readers Scope. The magazine is operated by Leverett Gleason, well-known supporter of Communist causes.

---

EXHIBIT No. 179-A

[New York World-Telegram, July 21, 1948]

PRO-COMMIE RESIGNS NEW YORK CENTRAL POST

Fred Myers, disclosed by the World-Telegram to be a fellow traveler, has resigned as chief of the public relations department of the Cleveland office of the New York Central Railroad, a railroad spokesman announced today.

Mr. Myers' tenure with the railroad was short-lived. It was only last Monday that the line announced his appointment to the Cleveland post.

However, the World-Telegram disclosed that he had been connected with the American Russian Institute as executive director. The organization has been listed by Attorney General Tom Clark as subversive.

Mr. Myers formerly was editor of the CIO American Newspaper Guild's publication, the Guild Reporter, when the guild was under leftwing control, and, during the war, was an official of the Russian War Relief.

MR. MORRIS. What was your next employment, then, Mr. Myers?

MR. MYERS. I believe that the next employment was the American Humane Association.

MR. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us about that?

MR. MYERS. It is a national federation of humane societies, about 80 years old, and endowed. It participates in work of various kinds to prevent cruelty, to protect animals and children, and the aged, from mistreatment.

MR. MORRIS. Now, what was your job with the American Humane Society?

MR. MYERS. I was editor of the National Humane Review.

MR. MORRIS. Did you disclose to the officials of the American Humane Association the fact that you had been active in the American-Russian Institute?

MR. MYERS. Yes; in fact, I even showed them the clipping from the World-Telegram.

MR. MORRIS. Will you describe your duties with the publication of the American Humane Society?

MR. MYERS. It was just an ordinary editorial job. It was a monthly magazine devoted entirely to the work of the association and the subjects in which it was interested.

MR. MORRIS. What is the membership of that organization?

MR. MYERS. I believe about 3,000 persons and about 200 societies.

MR. MORRIS. Two hundred societies. And the membership of those member societies is what swells the total to a very large number, is it not?



Mr. MYERS. Well, they are not members of a very large association.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you, after you became the editor of their publication, engage in an effort to take over control of that organization?

Mr. MYERS. I beg your pardon?

Mr. MORRIS. After you became the editor of the publication of the American Humane Society, did you engage in an effort to take over control of that organization?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you do anything to support a list of candidates who were in opposition to the controlling force in the organization?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. MYERS. Well, it was my opinion that the activities of the American Humane Association were pretty poorly conducted, that the policies being pursued were not those which were the wishes of the contributors and members and those who had left endowments to the organization, and that they were not, in short, very principled, and when a slate of three directors to run against a slate nominated by the board of directors was nominated in 1953, I certainly supported the candidates who were competing with those nominated by the board of directors.

Mr. MORRIS. The board of directors at that time, however, the opposition slate to whom you were supporting, were your superiors, were they not?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And then you elected to oppose them?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us what efforts you engaged in in support of this opposition slate?

Mr. MYERS. Well, it was limited solely to correspondence with a limited number of people. For obvious reasons, I couldn't engage very actively.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Myers, did you have access to the subscription list of the organization?

Mr. MYERS. To the what?

Mr. MORRIS. Subscription list, or the membership list?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you make use of those lists in carrying out the support of this rival organization, or this rival slate?

Mr. MYERS. No. Lest I leave a misunderstanding, I think I know personally perhaps a thousand people in this movement. I wrote to many people whom I know.

Mr. MORRIS. And where did you have their addresses?

Mr. MYERS. I guess I have visited at least 500 of them, and all of my life I have made a practice of keeping an address book of people with whom I correspond.

Mr. MORRIS. So that it is your statement that you have the addresses of 1,000 members of the American Humane Society in your address book?

Mr. MYERS. No; I didn't say a thousand. I don't know exactly. But—

Mr. MORRIS. I thought you said a thousand.

Mr. MYERS. I said that I knew a thousand.



Mr. MORRIS. But you have not corresponded with that number?

Mr. MYERS. I understand the import and the direction of your questions. Perhaps I can shorten it.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you.

Mr. MYERS. It has been charged before by certain officers of the American Humane Association that their lists were misused by someone. I don't have any knowledge of any misuse of their lists, and certainly I had no part in any such misuse of their lists. The people who were active and who consulted with each other in support of the slate which opposed the candidates of the board of directors, and which slate, incidentally, was elected, included people who have been eminent for many years in the work of humane societies all over the country. It included people who are officers of humane societies all over the country, and a list was compiled by consultation of many people.

Lists were supplied from all parts of the country. And it was not at all necessary to misuse the lists available in the headquarters of the American Humane Association, and I know of no such misuse.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, as a result of this activity, was your employment with the American Humane Association terminated?

Mr. MYERS. It is a nice point. Substantially, yes. I resigned, but had I not resigned, they would have beat me to it.

Mr. MORRIS. And then did you endeavor to form your own organization, Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. There again, I must clarify. I did not endeavor to organize my own organization, no. There was quite a group of people who participated in organizing the National Humane Society, and I certainly was no more than one of a group.

Mr. MORRIS. You were the leader of the group, were you not?

Mr. MYERS. No; I think not.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your position now?

Mr. MYERS. I am executive director.

Mr. MORRIS. Isn't that the principal office of the new organization?

Mr. MYERS. No. I am very much subservient to my board of directors, and the chief officer is the chairman of the board.

Mr. MORRIS. When was this new organization formed?

Mr. MYERS. November 1954.

Mr. MORRIS. And what work do you do with that organization?

Mr. MYERS. I am in charge of staff work, which is devoted to working on cruelties of national scope, as distinguished from those which are commonly handled by local societies.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony, Mr. Myers, that you have never been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. You have never attended closed meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. MYERS. No.

Senator JENNER. And Mr. Clayton Knowles falsified when he said that, reading from our record:

Mr. KNOWLES. No; he was not the first person. He was the person at St. Louis who said, "Would you like to come around and hear a summary of what went on here, an analysis of the effectiveness of this convention?"

Mr. SOURWINE. And you knew him to be a Communist?

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not then, but he later—it was he who disclosed when we got there that this was a Communist meeting.

In other words, Mr. Clayton Knowles, of the New York Times, falsified when he stated that?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Knowles was in error.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Myers.

Senator JENNER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. We have one more witness, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. MYERS. Judge Morris, it doesn't matter to me whether it is on the record or not, but I don't know whether you have taken note of the fact that, according to the newspaper reports, Mr. Knowles didn't even know my name correctly.

Mr. MORRIS. I think we have read very carefully. The name used was "Myer" at the time.

Mr. MYERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. But Mr. Knowles went on to say that you were then the chairman of the chapter of the New York Mirror Guild, the Newspaper Guild.

Mr. MYERS. I am only——

Mr. MORRIS. And you acknowledged that at that time you did have that position.

Mr. MYERS. That is correct. But I am only making the point that Mr. Knowles' memory as to my identity had some weak spots. And I have wondered repeatedly, since I read in the newspaper that he had stated that I was a Communist and since it was revealed to me in my earlier appearance before this committee that he had said that I invited him to such a meeting, how in the world he could remember the detail of such contacts in such a meeting as that convention was, because I for the life of me could not recall with whom I talked, at what meetings, about what, and I don't remember Mr. Knowles, even though I have tried to remember Mr. Knowles. I wouldn't know him if I saw him. And I just don't see how he can remember such a thing when I can't.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Myers.

Mr. Gerald Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Senator JENNER. Do you swear the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF GERALD W. ROGERS, FINANCE SECRETARY, AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Rogers, will you give your full name and address to the reporter.

Mr. ROGERS. Gerald W. Rogers, and I am the finance secretary of the American Humane Association of Denver.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the American Humane Association?

Mr. ROGERS. It is a national federation of humane societies concerned with the prevention of cruelty to children and animals.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the membership and constituency of that organization?

Mr. ROGERS. As of yesterday morning, we had 312 member societies—those were organizations—and 2,653 individual members.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you made any effort to determine what the collective membership of the constituent organizations is?

Mr. ROGERS. Judge Morris, it is a matter about which I hardly think anybody could be accurate. But to the best of our knowledge, the 312 societies in the United States would have in the memberships of their own, several hundred thousand.

Mr. MORRIS. Collectively?

Mr. ROGERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do you have a treasury?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, we do.

Mr. MORRIS. Approximately what is the amount of money in your treasury?

Mr. ROGERS. As of January 1, 1956, we had an endowment fund of approximately three million and a half.

Mr. MORRIS. Dollars?

Mr. ROGERS. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do you know Fred Myers, the witness here, who appeared here this morning?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you have a position with the American Humane Association at the time that he was retained as the editor of its publication?

Mr. ROGERS. No, sir, I did not. That was prior to my time.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what position did Mr. Myers hold with your organization?

Mr. ROGERS. He was the editor of the National Humane Review.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Mr. Myers?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know of this effort that he has testified to this morning, to support a slate in opposition to the controlling group in the organization?

Mr. ROGERS. Of my own knowledge, I learned it for the first time this morning, although we, of course, were fairly sure that such was the case.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know of anyone, Mr. Rogers, who can testify to Mr. Myers' efforts on behalf of the American Humane Association?

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I know quite a few people who say they can, but again, whether they know it of their actual knowledge or merely suspect it, as I did personally, I couldn't say.

Mr. MORRIS. But you are not competent to testify to that?

Mr. ROGERS. Not on that point, no, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think we should take testimony from this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JENNER. Thank you very much.

The committee will stand in recess.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

At a public hearing of the subcommittee on March 16, 1956, at which Senator Arthur V. Watkins presided, the following record was made:

Senator WATKINS. The committee will be in session.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, there are no witnesses at this session. We have some documents to put in the record and an inaccuracy that was made yesterday to be rectified.

Yesterday, in the course of Fred Myers' testimony, the subcommittee heard that witness read from a letter which he states was pro-

vided by Raymond F. Blosser, publicity director of the New York Central. The paragraph of the Blosser letter quoted by Mr. Myers read:

In brief, Mr. Myers was discharged by the New York Central after about 6 weeks with the railroad because publication of the New York World-Telegram story involved the Central in a controversy and not because anyone at the Central believed Mr. Myers was a Communist. Subsequently at Mr. Dugan's request the Central's police department checked with the FBI on the matter and led us to believe that the FBI had no evidence justifying doubts as to Mr. Myers' loyalty.

That is the end of the quote.

Now, just in order to keep the record straight, Senator, this morning the committee staff checked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and we were informed by that organization that their records show that on July 20, 1948, an attorney representing the New York Central did ask the FBI whether or not it possessed any derogatory information about Fred Myers. We have learned from the FBI that that attorney was informed that longstanding regulations prohibited the FBI from giving any information in its files to an agency outside the Federal Government concerning Mr. Myers or any of the organizations with which he was affiliated, and his request was denied.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put several letterheads of the American-Russian Institute into the record.

Mr. Mandel, will you identify them, please?

Mr. MANDEL. The letterhead of the American-Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union, 56 West 45th Street, New York, dated July 14, 1938.

(The letterhead referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 180" and reads as follows:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 180

THE AMERICAN-RUSSIAN INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL  
RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, INC.,  
*Fifty-six West Forty-fifth Street, New York, July 14, 1938.*

Telephone: Murray Hill 2-0312 Cable address: Amruscul

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. Kathleen Barnes  
Aaron Bodansky  
Edward C. Carter  
Mrs. Ethel Clyde  
Louis Connick  
George S. Counts  
Wm. O. Field, Jr.  
Lewis Gannett  
Mortimer Graves  
Wm. S. Graves  
Alean Hirsch  
John A. Kingsbury  
Mary van Kleeck  
Wm. W. Lancaster  
William Lescaze  
William Allan Neilson  
Mrs. George F. Porter  
Raymond Robins

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS—CON.

Geroid T. Robinson  
John Rothschild  
Mrs. Richard B. Scandrett, Jr.  
Whitney Seymour  
Henry E. Sigerist  
Lee Simonson  
Vilhjalmur Stefansson  
Graham R. Taylor  
Allen Wardwell  
Maurice Wartheim  
Mrs. Efrem Zimbalist

#### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Virginia Burdick

#### EDITOR

Harriet Moore

Many subscribers to the publications of The American-Russian Institute have requested information as to how they might investigate more fully the cultural developments in the Soviet Union that are regularly summarized in the Bulletin and Quarterly.

For their benefit and for other serious students of social, economic, and international affairs, we have made available to members of the Institute our unique



library of some 70 periodicals relating to the Soviet Union. Of those published in English, there are 10 monthlies, 4 semimonthlies, 10 weeklies, and 2 dailies. Those published in Russian include 20 monthlies, 8 semimonthlies, 10 weeklies, and 6 dailies. The fields of specialization, which are covered in detail by this collection of current information, include the following:

Agriculture	Foreign Relations	Public Health
Arctic	Government	Religion
Art	Housing	Recreation
Aviation	Industry	Science
Cinema	Labor	Theater
Cooperatives	Literature	Trade
Defense	Music	Women
Economics	Nationalities	Youth
Education	Philosophy	
Finance	Planning	

If your major interests lie within one or more of these fields, you will no doubt wish to become a member of the Institute. The fee is only \$5 a year (\$3 for those living outside the New York Metropolitan Area). Membership will include not only subscription to the two Institute publications, but also the privilege of consulting all the periodicals on file in our library. Arrangements can be made for borrowing them by mail. Translation, abstracting, and bibliographical service are also available.

There are other benefits and advantages of membership in the Institute, as you will see from the enclosed leaflet. We shall be very glad to welcome you as a member and to arrange a pro rata transfer of your subscription to a membership basis.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGINIA BURDICK.

VB/cw

# INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

## A

	Page
Albany, N. Y.....	487
Alexander, Henry.....	488
American Ambassador.....	482
American Humane Association.....	487, 490-492, 494
American Humane Association of Denver.....	493, 494
American Newspaper Guild.....	476-488
American Peace Mobilization.....	479
American Red Cross.....	482
American-Russian Institute.....	471-473, 482, 483, 485, 489, 490, 495
American Society for Russian Relief.....	482, 483, 485, 488
Atkinson, Brooks.....	484
Attorney General.....	473, 485

## B

Blosser, Raymond F.....	488, 495
Bridges, Harry.....	479, 480
Broun, Heywood.....	475, 477
Bunker, Ellsworth.....	482

## C

California Committee on Un-American Activities.....	487
Carter.....	473
Carter, Edward C.....	484
Carter, Mrs.....	473
Carter, Mr.....	486
Central.....	498
Central's Press Bureau.....	488
Cleveland.....	488
Cleveland Press.....	488
Collins, Henry H., Jr.....	483
"Comments by Officers of the U. S. S. R. I. P. R. on Present Crisis in the Far East".....	473
Communist.....	471, 475-478, 485, 487, 489, 492, 493, 495
Communist caucus.....	475
Communist-controlled.....	489
Communist faction.....	479
Communist Party.....	474-476, 478, 483, 492

## D

Davis, Pope, Reid & Wardwell.....	488
Dugan, C. R.....	489

## E

Exhibit No. 176 (The Guild Reporter, May 1, 1941)—Ex-Red Guildsman Strikes at Bridges.....	480, 481
Exhibit No. 176-A (The Guild Reporter, February 1, 1941)—Peace Meet Asks Help of Guild.....	481

	Page
Exhibit No. 177 (New York Times, August 29, 1945, p. 8)—Russian Aid Chief Gets Soviets Honor.....	484, 485
Exhibit No. 178 (New York Times, August 16, 1948, p. 2)—American Relief Workers Tell of Conditions in Russia.....	486, 487
Exhibit No. 179 (New York World-Telegram, July 19, 1948)—Fellow Traveler Takes the New York Central.....	489, 490
Exhibit No. 179-A (New York World-Telegram, July 21, 1948)—Pro-Commie Resigns New York Central Post.....	490
Exhibit No. 180 (56 West 45th St., New York, July 14, 1938)—The American-Russian Institute for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union, Inc., letterhead.....	495, 496

## F

FBI.....	489, 495
"Fellow Traveler Takes a Ride on the New York Central".....	488
Fifth amendment.....	483

## G

Gelfan, Harriet Moore.....	483
Georgian Republic.....	486
Germans.....	481
Government, Federal.....	495
Guild Reporter.....	475, 477-479

## H

Hitler-Stalin Pact.....	479, 481
Honig, Nathaniel.....	479

## I

Institute of Pacific Relations.....	471, 473, 484-487
Internal Security Subcommittee.....	471, 472

## J

Jenner, Senator William E.....	471
--------------------------------	-----

## K

Kalinin, President.....	483
Kansas City Journal.....	474
Kaufman, Milton.....	475
Kislova, Miss.....	473
Knowles, Clayton.....	474, 476, 492, 493
Kohlberg, Alfred.....	486

## L

Lancaster, Mr.....	485
Lancaster, W. W.....	482
Leningrad.....	486
London.....	484

## M

MVD.....	471
Mandel, Mr.....	472
Military Intelligence Service.....	472
Minsk.....	486
Moore, Harriet.....	482, 483
Morgan, J. P., Inc.....	488
Morris, Judge.....	493, 494
Moscow.....	473, 486
Motylev.....	473
Myer.....	493

	Page
Myers, Fred (testimony of).....	473-494
4328 Brandywine NW., Washington, D. C.....	473
Executive director, National Humane Society.....	473
1923, reporter for Kansas City Journal.....	474
1931, employed with United Press.....	474
1934-37, employed with New York Mirror.....	474
1935-37, chairman New York Daily Mirror unit of New York News- paper Guild.....	474
1939-40, editor, The Guild Reporter.....	477
1941-August 1946, public relations director, American Society for Russian Relief of National War Fund.....	479
Executive director of American-Russian Institute.....	482
Aug. 29, 1945, received Order of the Red Banner from President Kali- nin of the Supreme Soviet.....	483
Summer 1946, went to Soviet Union.....	486
Wrote articles for Readers Scope.....	487
American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y.....	487
June 1948, employed by New York Central.....	487
Editor, National Humane Review.....	490
Denied membership in Communist Party.....	492

## N

National American Society for Russian Relief.....	479, 483
National Humane Review.....	490, 494
National Humane Society.....	473, 492
National War Fund.....	479
New York.....	488
New York Central.....	487-489, 495
New York Central Railroad.....	488
New York City.....	473, 482
New York Daily Mirror unit of the New York Newspaper Guild.....	474, 493
New York Mirror.....	474
New York Mirror Guild.....	493
New York Times.....	474, 483, 486, 493
New York World-Telegram.....	488, 495
Newspaper Guild.....	474, 475, 477, 493

## O

Order of the Red Banner.....	483
Order of the Red Banner of Labor.....	484

## P

Pasch, Victor.....	475
Philadelphia.....	473
Political Intelligence Service.....	472
Portland, Oreg.....	489
President's War Relief Control Board.....	479

## R

Rastvorov, Yuri.....	471
Readers Scope.....	487
Rogers, Gerald W. (testimony of).....	493, 494
Finance secretary of American Humane Association of Denver.....	493
Russia.....	488
Russian Relief.....	484
Russian War Relief, Inc.....	486

## S

St. Louis.....	474, 492
St. Louis convention.....	476
San Francisco.....	473
Scripps-Howard.....	488
Sherman.....	482



	Page
Socialist.....	477
South American.....	482
Soviet Intelligence Service.....	472
Soviet, Supreme.....	483
Soviet Union.....	472, 481, 482, 486
Stalin.....	487
Stalingrad.....	486
Sterling.....	482
T	
Tass.....	472
Tbilisi.....	486
Tokyo.....	472
U	
U. S. S. R.....	473
United Press.....	474
United States.....	472, 474, 482, 494
V	
VOKS.....	471, 472
VOX.....	473
W	
Wardwell, Allen.....	488
Ware, Harold, cell of the Communist Party.....	483
Watkins, Senator Arthur V.....	494
Westchester County weekly.....	488
World-Telegram.....	489
World War II.....	488
Wright.....	482



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 4044









